

By Mr. LESTER: Petition of the heirs of Alfred E. Jones, deceased, late of Chatham County, Ga., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Protest of John R. Kelley and 64 other citizens of Maine, against subsidy to foreign-built vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONG: Resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Anthony and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Marquette, Kans., in relation to the exclusion of all spirituous liquors from our insular possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of Washington Ransom, of Walker County, Ga., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of L. H. Drury Post, No. 467, and George G. Meade Post, No. 444, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, in favor of House bill No. 5779, known as the "veteran preference measure"—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MCALEER: Petition of retail druggists of Philadelphia, Pa., for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Produce Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAYNE: Resolutions of Albert M. Murray Post, No. 163, Department of New York, in favor of House bill No. 5779, known as the "veteran preference measure"—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of East Auburn and of Cayuga County, N. Y., union meetings of Methodist Episcopal churches of Wolcott, N. Y., and the Methodist Episcopal Church of Sodus, N. Y., against island saloons and Army canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Weedsport, N. Y., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of A. H. Holt, W. F. Wilken, R. E. Weidler, and other citizens of Indiana, in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Jacob H. Harter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of George Van Horn Post, No. 39, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Connecticut, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5779, relating to the appointment of war veterans to the public service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of druggists of Waterbury, Conn., for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the State Board of Trade of Connecticut, urging the passage of House bill relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of various citizens of New Haven, Conn., against the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Meriden, Conn., against the sale of intoxicating liquors in our new possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Retail Grocers' Association of Minneapolis, Minn., against the parcel-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, urging the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the United States Brewers' Association, for the repeal of the war tax of \$1 per barrel on beer in the war-revenue act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the New York Mercantile Exchange, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolutions of Staunton Post, No. 396, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5779, giving veterans preferment in public service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of 6 citizens of Kendall, N. Y., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist congregations of Wyoming County, N. Y., asking extension of treaty excluding slavery, rifles, and spirituous liquors from portions of Africa, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, praying for a reduction of the war-revenue tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 5, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

JOHN C. SPOONER, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

## COST OF NAVAL TRANSPORTATION, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 23, 1900, reports from the various bureaus of the Navy Department, containing information relative to the armed vessels, tenders, and war ships sent to the Philippines, or from there since May 1, 1898, their tonnage, traveling distances, etc., tolls paid the Suez Canal Company, distances covered in time of the cruise of the *Oregon* from the Pacific coast to Manila, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

## ELECTORAL VOTES OF MARYLAND.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a certified copy of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice-President appointed in the State of Maryland at the election held therein on the 6th day of November, 1900; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

## SARAH E. NORTON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the court in the cause of Sarah E. Norton, administratrix, vs. The United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

## CREDENTIALS.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I present the credentials of SAMUEL D. MCENERY, elected a Senator from the State of Louisiana for the term beginning the 4th of March, 1903. I ask that they be read and placed on file.

The credentials of SAMUEL DOUGLAS MCENERY, chosen by the legislature of the State of Louisiana a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1903, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. MCENERY presented the credentials of Murphy James Foster, chosen by the legislature of the State of Louisiana a Senator from that State for the term commencing March 4, 1901; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I present the credentials of my colleague, who has been elected a Senator from the State of Rhode Island for six years, commencing March 4, 1901.

The credentials of GEORGE PEABODY WETMORE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1901, were read and ordered to be filed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Dental Society, the Odontographic Society, and the Odontological Society, all of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, and of the Tri-State Dental Societies of Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of Army dental surgeons in the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of members of the National Convention of Good Roads, praying that an appropriation be made to carry on the construction of good roads under the supervision of the director of public road inquiries; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Ladies' Aid Society of the Presbyterian Church of Minonk, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petitions of Isaac Norris, of Deselm; John Rice, of Deselm; F. M. Wright, of Manteno; V. W. Lawrence, of Manteno; J. J. Mattingly, of Champaign; John J. Lingle, of Mill-creek; Jacob Gerhart, of Allison; Walter Vantile, of Carthage; A. L. Hitz, of Grantfork; John Andrew, of Caledonia; C. E. Drake,



of Chapin; Charles I. Forrest, of Woodstock; Fred C. Schrodt, of Sugar Creek; W. F. Mason, of Willow Hill; C. M. Wright, of Manteno; Edgar Durham, of Princeton; F. Arnold & Co., of Woodbine; W. H. Keefe, of Long View; T. A. Manning, of Pittwood; George Ralston, of Caledonia; F. Shintz, of Shipman; E. Brantigan, of Shipman; R. W. Hiff, of Washburn; H. M. Burbank, of Elkville; Mason Hatch, of Griggsville; E. E. Pratt, of Tompkin; H. H. Spooner, of Hebron; John Overby, of Dongola; C. W. Risley, of Mount Carmel; E. G. Britton, of Beechwood; James A. Jackson, of Dale; Geo. R. Wilson, of Cameron; Joseph Vogel, of Benson; G. N. Melenay, of Thompson; Pleasant Valley Creamery Company; N. C. Bank, of Ellsworth; S. G. Stagin, of Elliott; Hiram Wallace, of Golconda; John R. Logan, of Junction City; J. F. Bute, of Kempton; M. I. Brown, of Garden Prairie; U. Garrett, of Weldon; J. S. Blackman, of Stonefort; J. W. Bradford, of Adrian; Joseph Beland, of Danforth; Herbert Lemenage, of Clifton; A. C. McCullough, of Savoy; the Rock Island County Farmers' Institute; Isaac Cole, of Sidney; J. P. Brennenman, of Vandalia; Isaac Thomas, of Donovan; Bird C. Pate, of Catlin; Henry H. Dusslen, of Garrett; John A. Demand, of Wapella; Joel D. Jones, of Wilton Center; J. J. Shively, of Cerro Gordo; Christian Camp, of Metamora; James H. Olle, of Pittwood; A. H. Gernand, of Rossville; J. R. Black, of Hastings; L. C. Newcomb, of Iron; S. J. Harrington, of Cisne; John M. Pearson, of Goodfrey; Martin I. Engler, of Willstadt; Ora E. Hanna, of Ava; John Ellet, of Grand Tower; John Sinoot, of Pulaski; Wiley Sipe, of Elkville; Iscar Maxey, of Mount Vernon; Nicholas Hahn, of Ogden; David Allan, of Weldon; J. M. Rock, of Tiatt; J. B. Smith, of Galden Gate; Hiram Reed, of Mossville; John Holdman, of Joliet; J. A. Phillips, of Damascus; M. Hubbell, of Carthage; A. J. Cunningham, of Bowen; George H. Baldwin, of Mendon; the Eleroy Stock Creamery Co., of Eleroy; Frederick Nilkenning, of Crete; John T. Lee, of Arthur; C. W. McNair, of Dahlgren; William McFarland, of Allendale; Simon Block, of Harper; S. W. Peak, of Winchester; H. B. Rice, of Lewistown; Eli C. Fisk, of Havana; G. H. Gurler, of Dekalb; H. D. De Long, of Galesburg; G. W. Ferner, of Washington; John W. Reid, of Argyle; M. C. Clory, of Rockton; A. A. Spickerman, of Dekalb; Oliver H. Perry, of Mount Sterling; John Pratt, of Loraine; John Beck, of Milan; William A. Mealliff, of Mendon; Harry Binney, of Binney; Riley Smith, of Colusa; T. J. Armstrong, of Mount Vernon; F. M. Brown, of Diswood; G. D. Jones, of Mount Vernon; F. Thies, of Campbell Hill; G. G. Corley, of Unionville; M. H. Bagby, of Olmsted; Jos. Miller, of Louisville; L. R. Stricklin, of Raleigh; R. F. Jenkins, of Frankfort; T. M. Carroll, of Ina; J. W. Hill, of Charleston; J. H. Riter, of Powellton; William Trainer, of Custer Park, Ill.; F. D. Bacon, of Media; E. D. Morrill, of Powellton; Frank W. Baird, of Custer Park; M. H. Creider, of Otten; James Morris, of Galena; W. M. Miller, of Haldane; Fred. Buser, of Marshall; William Dittman, of Marshall; F. A. Drury, of Carlton; A. Stewart, of Kirkwood; L. E. Smith, of Muncie; C. W. Somme, of Dewey; John F. Hubbell, of Wapella; Harvey Abbott, of Danvers; J. C. South, of Orin; P. H. Blanchet, of Exlim; J. R. Elder, of Ogden; T. M. Cavitt, of Ozark; Jacob Deen, of Azotus; Eben Stookey, of Freeburg; J. Alphonsus, of Ruma; James H. Simpson, of Ruma; John Jone, of Wilton Center; C. D. Greve, of Garrett; John M. Tudor, of McLean; Christ Gebhardt, of Blackstone; J. B. Humphreys, of Midland City; Harry R. Smith, of Stillman Valley; B. H. Daugherty, of Onargo; C. W. Cardiff, of Dewitt; T. O. Thompson, of Perdue; B. N. Powley, of Papapinsau; W. H. Luxton, of Hudson, Ill.; John Blank, of Rio; C. C. Safford, of Hamilton; J. B. Campbell, of Lacrosse; Riber Merrill, of Youngstown; G. Wilcox, of Eno; H. W. Frederick, of Washington; C. E. Schlots, of Elmwood; J. F. Oldendorf, of Hoxen; J. Wright & Sons, of Fenton; J. C. Wenner, of Pontiac; E. Santer, of Marseilles; John W. Cutforth, of Liberty; Charles A. Hummel, of Dewey; John Maffitt, of Martinton; and J. Bartlett, of Colusa, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented sundry petitions of citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gainesville, of Albert Roy, jr., and sundry other citizens of Elmira; of W. K. Palmer and sundry other citizens of New Rochelle; of J. B. Rice and sundry other citizens of Cambridge; of Thomas Smith and sundry other citizens of New York City; of H. H. Todd and sundry other citizens of New Rochelle, Mount Vernon, and Brooklyn; of Frank J. New and sundry other citizens of New Rochelle; of Howard R. Ware and sundry other citizens of New Rochelle; of Charles Hyatt and sundry other citizens of New York City; of D. P. Whitaker and sundry other citizens of Savona; of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Presbytery of Rochester; of the League for Social Service; of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and of the Oneida, Che-

nango, and Delaware Association of the Congregational churches of Sherburne, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Lucius K. Smalling, of Cohoes, N. Y., praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, praying for the establishment of a department of commerce and manufactures; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of E. S. Young Post, No. 33, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Amsterdam, N. Y., and a petition of Frank Head Post, No. 16, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation giving preference to veterans in the public service; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Joseph M. Huffman, of Lockport; of the United Trades and Labor Council of Erie County, and of the Onondaga Whisk Broom Works, of Syracuse, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect free labor from prison competition; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Reed Corners, N. Y., and a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Groton, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in Alaska, Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also presented petitions of Rev. W. H. Dodd, of Garfield; of Edward Kirkalcott, of Goshen, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Yonkers, all in the State of New York, praying for the ratification of the treaty providing for the protection of the people of Central Africa against the sale of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Thomas J. Deyo and sundry other citizens of Wallkill, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all of our new island possessions, including the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of B. G. Dutton, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Philippines to native races, as in Alaska, and also to abolish saloons and the opium traffic; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the American Library Association of Dorchester, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the better publication and distribution of public documents; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BURROWS presented the petition of W. A. Ellis, of Marlette, and sundry other citizens of Michigan, and the petition of J. B. Moore, of Lennon, and sundry other citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THURSTON presented 31 petitions of citizens of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Church of Neenah, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all countries inhabited chiefly by native races; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. SEWELL presented sundry petitions of citizens of Mullica Hill, Trenton, Allentown, Wrightstown, Madison, Ardena, Morris town, Burlington, Hackettstown, Jacksonville, Harrington, Williamstown, Woodstown, Whitehouse, Readington, Newmarket, Rosemont, Franklin Park, Oxford, and Cranberry, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boonton, Newark, Hanover, Dividing Creek, and East Orange, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the executive council of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for a modification of the stamp-tax law; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Captain George Lawrence Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minersville; of General Thomas A. Rowley Post, No. 495, Grand Army of the Republic, of Natrona, and of General Welsh Post, No. 118, Grand Army of



the Republic, of Columbia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation giving preference to veterans in the public service; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of 27 citizens of Pennsylvania, 44 citizens of Carbondale, 36 citizens of Chester County, of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Wilkesbarre, of the Young Men's Christian Association of Wilkesbarre, and of the Ladies' Foreign Missionary Society of Montrose, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Philippines, in any post exchange, canteen, or transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. HARRIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Highland, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Army and all island possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation, reclamation, and settlement of the public domain; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension of the soil surveys in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Wholesalers' Board of Trade of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER presented 13 petitions of sundry citizens of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Jacob L. Crosby and 19 other citizens of Bath, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented fifteen petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### ZERILDA COBB.

Mr. COCKRELL. For reference to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany the bill (S. 496) for the relief of Zerilda Cobb, I present the affidavits of Eliza Murphy, William Chitwood, E. A. Lee, and Alice Lee, and move that they be referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

#### SIOUX INDIAN OUTBREAK AND MASSACRE OF 1862.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs the history, by Samuel J. Brown, of the Minnesota outbreak and massacre of 1862. It is not long, and I think it is a very important document. It is a portion of the history that has never been written before. It ought to go into the archives of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota to print as a document the paper he sends to the desk? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered. It will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4936) to provide for the construction of a bridge by the Fargo, Duluth and Northwestern Railroad Company across the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak., reported it without amendment.

#### CLINCH RIVER BRIDGE AT KINGSTON, TENN.

Mr. VEST. I move that the bill (H. R. 11548) to authorize the Kingston Bridge and Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Clinch River at Kingston, Tenn., which came from the House of Representatives yesterday, be substituted on the Calendar for the bill (S. 4852) to authorize the Kingston Bridge and Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Clinch River at Kingston, Tenn., being Order of Business 1471 on the Calendar, which I reported at the last session and which is identical with the House bill, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### CAPT. B. H. MACALLA AND COMMANDER WILLIAM C. WISE.

Mr. BACON. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a bill granting permission to Capt. B. H. MacCalla, United States Navy, and Commander William C. Wise, also of the United States Navy, to accept decorations tendered to them by the Emperor of Germany. Accompanying the bill are letters from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Navy indorsing the propriety of receiving these decorations. I am instructed by the committee to ask for the immediate consideration by the Senate of the bill.

The bill (S. 5024) granting permission to Capt. B. H. MacCalla, United States Navy, and Commander William C. Wise, United States Navy, to accept decorations tendered to them by the Emperor of Germany was read the first time by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is instructed by the committee to ask for the present consideration of the bill. It will be read in full to the Senate for its information.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Capt. B. H. MacCalla, United States Navy, and Commander William C. Wise, United States Navy, be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept, respectively, the decoration (including a diploma and insignia) of the Order of the Second Class of the Red Eagle with Swords, and the decoration (including a diploma and insignia) of the Order of the Second Class of the Royal Crown with Swords, tendered to them by the Emperor of Germany through the Department of State of the United States; and the Department of State is hereby authorized to deliver to them the decorations herein named.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5025) to correct the military record of Jacob S. Allen, alias Jacob Eikly; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Patents:

A bill (S. 5026) to revise the laws of the United States relating to trade-marks;

A bill (S. 5027) to regulate and protect marks, trade-marks, commercial names, and symbols used in commerce, and to enforce treaties regarding the same;

A bill (S. 5028) respecting applicants for patents not residing in the United States;

A bill (S. 5029) to give effect to treaty stipulations relating to letters patent for inventions; and

A bill (S. 5030) to revise the patent laws of the United States.

Mr. QUARLES introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5031) granting a pension to Margaret A. Potts (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 5032) granting a pension to John Geibel (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5033) granting a pension to Lizzie Barrett.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 5034) to create a circuit court of the United States for the tenth circuit, and to create a court of appeals of the United States for the tenth circuit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 5035) to provide for medical care and surgical treatment of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KYLE introduced a bill (S. 5036) granting an increase of pension to Norton Schermerhorn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 5037) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Gardner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5038) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burns; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced a bill (S. 5039) granting an increase of pension to Lucie M. Mabry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURNER introduced a bill (S. 5040) forbidding the payment of witness fees and mileage to Indians who instigate violations of the laws prohibiting the selling or disposal of intoxicating liquors to Indians; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 5041) for the relief of W. D. Gibbs, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the

accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

A bill (S. 5042) to authorize Ethelbert Watts, consul of the United States at Kingston, Jamaica, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Khedive of Egypt; and

A bill (S. 5043) to authorize George W. Hill, chief of the Division of Publications of the Department of Agriculture, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Government of the French Republic.

Mr. BARD introduced a bill (S. 5044) granting an increase of pension to George W. Frasher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 5045) granting a pension to Eliza N. Lord; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 5046) to revive the grade of Vice-Admiral in the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 5047) granting a pension to Lucinda W. Cavender; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Mrs. Lucinda W. Cavender, widow of John S. Cavender, late colonel Twenty-ninth Regiment Missouri Infantry Volunteers, together with the affidavits of several physicians and the military record. I move that these papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions, to accompany the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 5048) for the relief of W. O. Donovan and the heirs of Lizzie M. Donovan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 5049) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus A. Lothrop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Marsh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 5051) authorizing the Navajo and Moqui Indians to lease mineral lands within their reservations on a royalty basis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 5052) to declare the St. Joseph River in the State of Indiana, not navigable and validating structures thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### AMENDMENT TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MASON submitted an amendment fixing the salary of the private secretary to the Public Printer at \$2,400 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day.

Mr. LODGE. If the routine business is concluded, I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator make that motion now?

Mr. HOAR. I hope before my colleague makes the motion he will yield, that I may ask that the resolution called up yesterday by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], in regard to the credentials of claimants to the vacant seat from that State, may stand over until to-morrow with the same privilege that it would have to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CUBAN POSTAL SERVICE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day. Did the junior Senator from Massachusetts make a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or did he only give notice of a motion?

Mr. LODGE. I intended to make the motion now. I do not know what is desired in regard to the resolution which the Chair lays before the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I shall move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Relations with Cuba. I presume that will be satisfactory, perhaps, to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I presume so, Mr. President. Of course

I take it for granted that the Committee on Relations with Cuba will report or act promptly upon the resolution.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think within this week the committee will be able to furnish from the committee all the information that the Senator desires.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Then, very well. Let the resolution go to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read to the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PETTIGREW, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate all the information in his possession in relation to frauds in the postal service of Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 4742) to amend section 1225 of Revised Statutes so as to provide for detail of retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in schools;

A bill (H. R. 7571) to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8068) authorizing the board of supervisors of Pima County, Ariz., to issue fifty-year 5 per cent bonds of Pima County, Ariz., to redeem certain funded indebtedness of said county; and

A bill (H. R. 12283) in relation to the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the permanent seat of government in the District of Columbia.

#### CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, a bill has just come over from the House of Representatives providing for the exercises of the centennial celebration here on the 12th of this month. It is important. It simply provides for the order of exercises and the use of the Hall of the House of Representatives for the celebration. I should like very much to have it put upon its passage now. There is no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 12283) in relation to the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the permanent seat of government in the District of Columbia was read the first time by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read the second time in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate. Before the reading begins, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside pending the consideration of the bill from the House, which will be read the second time at length.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives have each appointed a committee to act with other committees appointed respectively by the President of the United States and by the citizens of the District of Columbia (in a mass meeting assembled), which committees have in charge the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the permanent seat of government in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas said committees have in joint session adopted a plan of celebration which has been submitted to the President of the United States and by him transmitted to Congress, such plan proposing as a feature of the celebration the holding by the Senate and House of Representatives, jointly, commemorative exercises in the Hall of the House of Representatives in the afternoon of the 12th day of December, 1900, in honor of the centennial anniversary of the first session of Congress held in the permanent capital: Therefore,

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on the 12th day of December, 1900, at the hour of half past 3 o'clock p. m., and that addresses on subjects bearing on the celebration shall be made by Senators and Representatives to be chosen by the joint committee mentioned in the preamble; that the President and ex-Presidents of the United States, the heads of the several Executive Departments, the justices of the Supreme Court, representatives of foreign governments accredited to this Government, the governors of the several States and Territories, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Lieutenant-General of the Army and the Admiral of the Navy, officers of



the Army and Navy who have received the thanks of Congress, and all persons who have the privilege of the floor either of the Senate or the House be, and are hereby, invited to be present on the occasion, and that the members of the committee from the country at large, the members of the said citizens' committee, and the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the committees of the national capital centennial are hereby granted the privilege of the floor of the House during the exercises; that the said citizens' committees shall issue cards of admission to such portions of the public galleries of the Hall of the House as may be set apart by the Doorkeeper of the House for that purpose; that the Speaker of the House shall call the assembly to order and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall act as presiding officer during the exercises; that the 12th day of December, 1900, be a legal holiday within the District of Columbia; that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to deliver to the Architect of the Capitol, for the purpose of decorating the Capitol, its approaches, and the reviewing stands in the Capitol grounds for the occasion, such United States ensigns and flags, except battle flags, and such signal numbers and others flags as may be spared, the same to be delivered to the Architect immediately, and returned by him not later than the 31st day of December, 1900; that admission of the general public to the southern portion of the Capitol, including the Rotunda, on the said 12th day of December, 1900, shall be by card only, under the direction of the Doorkeeper of the House; that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, for the occasion, to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure the preservation of public order and protection of life and property, and to grant authority or permits for the use of such thoroughfares and sidewalks in the city of Washington as may be necessary for parades, and that the citizens' committee are authorized to erect for the occasion a reviewing stand at the east side of or on the east steps of the Capitol.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

**MR. COCKRELL.** I should like to ask whether the bill makes the 12th day of December a national holiday?

**MR. HALE.** It makes it a legal holiday for the District of Columbia. The committee—

**MR. COCKRELL.** For all time to come, or just simply for this year?

**MR. HALE.** Only for this year. The committee that had it in charge at the other end of the Capitol—

**MR. COCKRELL.** The Senator is sure that it is only for this year?

**MR. HALE.** Undoubtedly.

**MR. COCKRELL.** If it is for all time to come, I am unalterably opposed to it.

**MR. HALE.** Let that part of the bill be read.

**MR. COCKRELL.** Let that part be read again.

**MR. HALE.** I know what the intention is. The provision in reference to the holiday is in the latter part of the bill.

**MR. COCKRELL.** I did not catch it. There were others talking equally as loud while it was being read.

**MR. HALE.** Of course, it ought to apply only to the present 12th of December.

**MR. PLATT** of Connecticut. It is on the third page of the bill. The Secretary read as follows:

That the 12th day of December, 1900, be a legal holiday within the District of Columbia.

**MR. HALE.** That is very clear.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no amendment proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

**MR. COCKRELL.** I understand that the Senator from Maine, the committee, and all those interested in this matter agree that the 12th of December is not to be a permanent holiday, but only in the year 1900.

**MR. HALE.** It is so stated definitively in the bill.

**MR. COCKRELL.** I know it may be claimed—

**MR. HALE.** It is the 12th of this December. There is no doubt about it at all.

**MR. COCKRELL.** I want to have it clearly understood, because there are a little too many holidays already.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 4742) to amend section 1225 of Revised Statutes so as to provide for detail of retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in schools; and

A bill (H. R. 7571) to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes.

The bill (H. R. 8068) authorizing the board of supervisors of Pima County, Ariz., to issue fifty-year 5 per cent bonds of Pima County, Ariz., to redeem certain funded indebtedness of said county, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories.

#### PROMOTION OF COMMERCE AND INCREASE OF TRADE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide

auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary.

**MR. FRYE.** Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate now to certain limitations upon the expenditures authorized in this bill.

There is a limitation of \$9,000,000; no more than that sum can be expended in any one year. So far as the cost to the Government is concerned, it is practically \$7,500,000, because these ships are required to carry the mails without charge. I think last year the mail pay was about \$1,400,000, and in a year or two years it will amount certainly to the \$1,500,000.

This limitation was placed in the bill by the Senate Committee on Commerce. It was in response to one of the misstatements and exaggerations about this measure that it would cost us \$50,000,000 a year, and I have seen a declaration that it would cost a hundred million dollars a year. There seems to be no method whatever in the madness of the critics of this bill.

The general committee of which I have spoken approved of that limitation without any hesitation, and they did it on this theory: We have been building in our shipyards the last twenty years possibly one merchant ship for the foreign carrying trade a year. I notice by the report of the Commissioner of Navigation that during the last ten years we have constructed about ten thousand of tonnage a year. Ten thousand tons would be the carrying capacity of about one low-power freight ship in modern times.

Now, Great Britain in the same time has been building these ships—low-power freight ships—by the wholesale. You would find in a single yard there fifteen or twenty merchant ships of the same tonnage, plans, dimensions, and speed. It is entirely clear that if you build ships by the wholesale you can construct them much more cheaply than you can where you have but one in your yard. For instance, take it in one of our shipyards now, one with which I am somewhat familiar. There are on the stocks a yacht, a side-wheel steamer, a barge, a torpedo boat, a schooner, and a bark. You put the mechanics upon the yacht and they must finish it as completely and as carefully in every appointment as you would one of the finest parlors in an American palace. They get into the habit of that finish. You put them immediately on a tramp ship, which is finished in the rough, practically, and half of their time for weeks is wasted in adapting themselves to the new work.

I was talking with a shipbuilder a few days ago, and he told me that in building two ships instead of one he could afford to make a discount of 10 per cent. He said that the same plans for the ship and the same patterns for all machinery could be used for the two, and that that would be a saving of nearly 10 per cent. Now, these skilled men on the general committee said they had no doubt at all that if this bill became a law and was the success they expected, in five years from now, with our immensely increased shipyards, with the increased competition, and with the building by wholesale instead of by retail, we would construct these ships as cheaply as Great Britain.

This \$9,000,000 limit will not be reached before five years from now. When it is, the Secretary of the Treasury is instructed in this measure to reduce pro rata the bounty sailing and the premium speed pay. The result of the limitation will be undoubtedly that in five years, the following years of five—because the bill limits the power of the Treasurer to make contracts to ten years—the five following years there will be annually a reduction in the amount which the Secretary is authorized to pay to these ships. So, no friends of the bill feel that there is any danger whatever in this limitation of \$9,000,000.

The American ships which are to receive the advantage of this pay are those to be registered and to engage in the foreign carrying trade. They will be required to file with the Secretary of the Treasury a satisfactory bond that within the next five years they will build in our own yards 25 per cent more of tonnage than they register and engage in foreign trade. They will receive no pay on the extra tonnage until it is completed and ready to carry.

Later on in the bill there is a provision admitting certain foreign-built ships to an American registry. There is a limitation upon the amount of the pay to be made to them of 50 per cent, and the Secretary of the Treasury is instructed to pay to them no part of the subsidy until they have duplicated the tonnage so admitted in our yards. The Secretary of the Treasury is to retain all those foreign-built ships, after they are registered here, would earn each year until they have made that duplication. Of course, when one ship is brought in under the registry and one of the same size, speed, and tonnage is constructed here, then they will receive their 50 per cent pay on the foreign-built ships and the full pay on the one which is constructed here.

**MR. HALE.** Will my colleague yield to me?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to his colleague?

**MR. FRYE.** With pleasure.

**MR. HALE.** Will my colleague tell the Senate what were the considerations moving the committee that led them to put in this provision for the admission of foreign-built ships?

Mr. FRYE. I will do that with pleasure a little later on when I come to that section.

There is another limitation contained in the bill that no ship shall be paid for more than 16 entries—that would be 16 trips—in any one year. I wish just here to call the attention of the Senate now to this fact. Senator Edmunds drafted this bill, and it may be unnecessary for me to say that he protected with steel armor the Government of the United States against all chances for fraud or evasion, as Senators will find when they read the bill in full.

There is an amendment proposed here touching American vessels. It is that those registered prior to January 1, 1900, shall not be paid the subsidy for more than ten years. Those built and registered after January 1, 1900, the Secretary may make contracts with for twenty years. The reason for that is this: Many of these ships have been in business for five, six, eight, and ten years, and the practical life of a ship is twenty. It was not deemed by the Senate Committee on Commerce that it was wise to take a ship, for instance, ten years old, and authorize a contract to be made with it extending over twenty years. The only division that could be made, entirely logical, was to take the ships which were in existence before this bill became a law or before January 1, 1900, and draw the line there.

There is another amendment on page 3, to which I will call the attention of the Senate. It requires these ships to carry as freight, sailing from a port in the United States to a foreign port, 50 per cent of their gross tonnage. The reason, if there is any reason for such an amendment as that, was that it was asserted, broad and large, that these ships would run, under the subsidy provided for, with a couple of barrels of flour and one passenger from a port of the United States to a foreign port and back from a foreign port to the United States—a mere sentimentality, the absurdity of which can be seen in one moment by just one ship which I will take as an example. I have quite a number of them, but I will take only one—a ship of 3,500 tons, a low-powered freight ship, running in ballast across the Atlantic Ocean and back.

The expense charged up against that ship for that voyage would be \$18,805. The subsidy paid to the ship would be \$3,344. The balance against the ship and the loss on that single voyage would be \$15,461. So Senators will see that it would not take many trips of such a ship as that to conclude her ship existence.

The amendment which has been offered by the committee, in my opinion, requires still further amendment, and for this reason: This requires 50 per cent of the gross tonnage in freight. Take a low-powered freight-carrying ship, *The Pleiades*, about a three or four thousand ton ship, and this requirement here would simply compel her to take an outgoing cargo of 20 per cent of her carrying capacity. Take the ship *St. Louis*, and the same requirement would compel her to take a cargo to the extent of her entire carrying capacity.

Now, the ships from 16 knots speed up to 21 knots, inclusive, will all undoubtedly be mail ships. The *St. Louis*, for instance, would, of course, be a mail ship. She would be compelled by the Government to sail at stated times, whether she had any cargo or not; and this requirement of the low-powered ship to take but 20 per cent and of the highest powered ship to take the entire cargo capacity is clearly entirely unjust and indefensible.

I shall submit to the Committee on Commerce to-morrow morning at its meeting an amendment to be substituted for this—an amendment which will provide that all ships shall take 50 per cent of their cargo capacity when leaving a port of the United States for a foreign port. That will increase the amount of cargo which must be taken, but it will so distribute it amongst the various ships that there will be no inequality or injustice; and I hope the Senate Committee on Commerce will adopt the amendment.

There was an amendment to clause E proposed by the Senate Committee on Commerce where the limitation of \$9,000,000 was contained. The amendment reads:

Of which \$9,000,000 not more than \$2,000,000 shall, in respect of any one fiscal year, be paid as compensation to the vessels described in paragraphs 8 and 9 of clause b of this section—

That is, to the two higher powered ships—

and of which \$9,000,000 not more than 70 per cent shall be expended in any one fiscal year in respect of vessels engaged in the Atlantic Ocean trade, except in case the Pacific Ocean trade shall not require, in respect of the vessels engaged in said last-mentioned trade, the expenditure of the whole amount of 50 per cent of said \$9,000,000 in any such year.

That amendment was agreed to by the committee in answer to certain criticisms, which were raised by friends of transportation in the Pacific Ocean, that there was danger that the Atlantic trade, which to-day so much exceeds the Pacific and has so many more ships in it, would consume the entire \$9,000,000 and leave nothing for the Pacific. The Senate Committee on Commerce was very desirous, indeed more desirous, of building up the transportation in the Pacific than they were in the Atlantic. They regard it as now of more importance than the trade in the Atlantic, and they very readily agreed to this amendment providing that no greater sum than is mentioned here should be expended in the Atlantic in any one year.

Section 2 is also an amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Commerce, which provides that no ship shall receive any of this pay, either bounty, sailing, or speed premium, unless it is rated A1; in other words, unless it shall be a first-class ship in every respect.

Section 4 contains a provision by which, if a ship is lost, another of like tonnage and speed may be substituted in her place.

Section 5 provides that at least one-fourth of the crews of all these aided ships shall be American citizens; and we have a law, to which reference is made here in this bill, which requires that all the officers of American ships shall be American citizens.

Section 6 provides for the usual naval tests as to the speed of these vessels.

Sections 7 and 8 provide bounties for fishing vessels and for fishermen. I do not think it is necessary for me to argue to the Senate that this is a valuable provision. In all of the wars this country has ever been engaged in on the ocean I think that the fishery fleet have furnished more and better sailors than have been found anywhere else. I remember that General Knox applauded the Marblehead fishermen in a speech he made for the wonderful ability, courage, and fidelity they displayed in the war of the Revolution.

The bill simply gives a bounty of \$2 a gross ton on the vessel which is engaged for three years.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does that come out of the \$9,000,000?

Mr. FRYE. No; I do not think so. It pays, also, to each American sailor on a fishing vessel for three months' service \$1 a month during the time necessarily employed in the voyage of such vessel. That will take about one hundred and seventy or one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars a year. I am sorry to say to the Senate that our fishing fleet is gradually being reduced year by year.

Mr. HALE. What does the Senator understand the scope of the phrase "deep-sea fisheries" to be?

Mr. FRYE. I understand it to refer to fishermen on the Banks. It is used to distinguish it from inshore.

Mr. HALE. To those on the Banks, and not to the mackerel fishermen?

Mr. FRYE. No.

Mr. HALE. Although that may be deep water. But this refers to the Newfoundland Banks?

Mr. FRYE. I am inclined to think if the mackerel fishing was pursued on the deep sea it would receive the bounty.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what other nations are doing in this regard. Canada's judicious use of the Halifax award of \$5,500,000, paid by the United States in 1878, is shown by the latest report of the Dominion department of marine and fisheries. That report shows that from 1882 to 1897, inclusive, Canada has paid \$2,521,909 in fishing bounties. The value of the catch in 1897, the last year reported, was \$22,783,546, the largest recorded in the report. The bounty paid was \$157,504, fishing vessels receiving \$1 per ton, and fishermen \$6, or about \$1 a month of actual service.

Of Germany's efforts, the British commercial attaché at Berlin has reported this year:

The large falling off in the sailing tonnage of the German mercantile marine is considered to be unsatisfactory from the point of view of training crews for sea service, and it is partly on account of this consideration that the Government now does a great deal to develop the fishing fleets of the Baltic and North seas.

The French consul at Dusseldorf reports that in about ten years Germany has spent upward of \$3,000,000 in opening up fishing harbors, and that at the Geestemunde Harbor the sales increased from 5,864 hundredweight in 1888 to 274,950 hundredweight in 1895. France in 1897 spent 620,935 francs directly in encouraging fishing vessels, besides more liberal bounties on the exported catch, and Japan last year voted \$75,000 per annum to develop deep-sea fisheries, an incident to maritime strength.

This bill proposes to expend about \$170,000 annually on American fisheries by precisely the same method Great Britain has employed for years in supporting Canadian fisheries. It must be remembered that our fishing vessels are compelled to pay a fishing license to purchase bait in Canadian waters.

I have forgotten exactly what that license for our fishing vessels is. Does my colleague remember it?

Mr. HALE. No; I do not now remember just what it is.

Mr. FRYE. My impression is that it is quite large, but I have forgotten the amount.

Section 9 is a section of exclusion. It excludes all vessels not in trade. Of course, that means yachts. It excludes vessels which under our statute have been wrecked on our shores and have been admitted, after an expenditure of three-quarters of their value has been laid out upon them here, to an American register. It excludes a vessel employed in the coasting trade, as a matter of course, because coasting vessels are protected absolutely now against any intervention from foreign ships. It also excludes—

A vessel on a voyage during any part of which she shall have carried passengers or cargo which under the laws of the United States could not



lawfully have been carried by a foreign vessel, or a vessel employed in the fisheries.

That peculiar language there is used because we found some few years ago that foreign ships were evading the coastwise law by carrying material or freight from one port of the United States to a foreign port and bringing it back to a home port again. Congress passed a law prohibiting that, and that is a reference to that law.

"D" excludes vessels between ports on the Atlantic coast and ports on the Pacific coast. They are coastwise, and coastwise whether they land the cargo at Panama and transport it across the Isthmus by rail and then reload and take it to San Francisco or elsewhere on the Pacific coast. Also—

(e) a vessel owned by a citizen of the United States which shall not be entitled under the provisions of section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The statute referred to is that which requires certain officers to be American citizens—all watch officers, etc.

"F" excludes all vessels sailing not more than 150 miles. That applies to all the vessels upon Puget Sound from Tacoma up to Vancouver or Victoria. They are not much more than ferries. Also to vessels, for instance, in Maine from Eastport to St. John.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What about vessels plying between Habana and Key West?

Mr. FRYE. It excludes those.

(g) A vessel on a voyage less than one-half of the whole length of which, on her outward and homeward voyages, respectively, shall have been on the sea, between a port of the United States and a foreign port.

That excludes vessels from the Great Lakes through the Welland Canal to Montreal.

Now I come to section 10, which admits foreign-built ships to American registry. There are three classes. The first is, ships engaged in an established freight business before January 1, 1900, that business being from ports of the United States to foreign ports, a majority of the ownership being in American citizens; second, also ships actually under construction by American citizens in foreign shipyards January 1, 1900; third, ships actually contracted for by American citizens in foreign yards before January 1, 1900; and it provides that all these ships must be rated A1, as first-class ships.

The reasons for that may be possibly partly sentimental. It has been utterly impossible for an American citizen, under existing conditions, to invest his money in American ships to engage in the foreign carrying trade. I think I must have satisfied Senators yesterday in that very long speech, which I wish to apologize for, that it was utterly absurd for an American to think for a moment of putting any money, under present conditions, into a ship which was to sail from our ports to foreign ports. The only way we have lived at all in this trade is that we have a few sailing ships engaged in it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FRYE. In a moment. These ships have taken cargoes of coal from the Atlantic side around the Cape and up to San Francisco, and then have registered and gone on voyages to foreign ports, being part coastwise and part foreign. Now I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Perhaps the Senator was going to allude to it, but I wish to inquire why was the date January 1, 1900, fixed?

Mr. FRYE. We were obliged to fix a date in order to be at all certain of how many ships this would include. If the bill was an invitation—and I am afraid it will not prove to be much of an invitation—if it was an invitation or a temptation to place these ships under the American flag with an American registry, then there might be a great many contracts made, of which we have but little knowledge, and we could make no real, genuine calculation as to what the requirements of the bill would be.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. But suppose a contract had been made in good faith by American citizens for the building of an American ship in a foreign yard, and concluded on the 1st of April last. Why would not that ship be just as much entitled to these advantages as if the contract had been made before the 1st of January, 1900?

Mr. FRYE. Suppose it was three months later, or four months. You might have made it the 1st of April, to be sure, but here was the bill pending. Everybody in the country knew what the bill was and what its terms were, and we desired to have a fixed limit, as nearly as it could be fixed, of the ships built in foreign ports which would be admitted to an American registry.

I was saying that perhaps part of this is sentiment. These men have been compelled if they wished to engage in shipping—and many men think that they can do nothing except on the sea—to go abroad to buy their ships, and, on account of operating expenses, to run them under foreign flags. We thought it would do no harm to admit such ships as those of the highest class to an American register.

Then again we were desirous of obtaining within the next five years as many ships under the American flag engaged in the for-

eign trade as it was possible to do. The requirement upon these shipowners is that they shall build here an equal amount of the same kind of tonnage for every ship which is registered here. They shall have ten years in which to do it. The best calculation that we could make was that about 350,000 tons would be so registered. If there were, that would require in ten years the expenditure of about \$50,000,000 in our American shipyards by American citizens. It would more than double the present capacity of our shipyards; it would employ many thousands more men, and it would create an enormous industry of infinite value in all the future to our country, both in times of peace and in times of war.

The objection has been made to that since, or it has been asserted since, by men of intelligence that 500,000 gross tons of ships will come in under that provision. That would be a carrying capacity of about 700,000 tons. I shall submit to the Senate Committee on Commerce to-morrow a substitute for this provision. One can be drafted without difficulty which shall make it absolutely certain just how many ships will come in under this provision.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FRYE. With pleasure.

Mr. PERKINS. If the Senator please, I should like to ask why the committee reduced the ownership in corporations operating foreign-built ships from 80 per cent to a bare majority. One of the strongest features of the bill is that it encourages American shipbuilding. If you permit foreign ships to come in, there will be no necessity for us to build any more ships.

Mr. FRYE. But they are compelled to build just as many more in our shipyards. As I said a moment ago, under this bill if 300,000 tons come in, they must build within ten years at least \$40,000,000 worth of ships in our yards, or else they will not get a dollar of this subsidy, and the registration under the terms of the bill will be revoked. That is provided for.

Mr. PERKINS. Those vessels were built by foreign mechanics.

Mr. FRYE. I will tell the Senator why I was willing. I think a majority is more logical than any particular per cent—80, 90, 70, or any other which might be named. Nearly all of the lines that would come in under the provisions of this bill are owned entirely by American citizens, with the exception of what little is required to be owned abroad in order that they may be able to sail under foreign flags. But I know of one line with a few very fine vessels where it was not certain that 60 per cent or 70 per cent would cover it. I was certain that 50 per cent would. So far as I was concerned, I was entirely willing that that line should come in and build four ships like the ones they have now in use.

Mr. HALE. Before the Senator leaves this most interesting feature of the bill I desire to say to him that while I am in entire sympathy with him on the general purposes of the bill, as so completely stated by him yesterday, I am troubled by the feature of introducing into the bill the provision for foreign-built ships. The Senator says that the provision for admitting foreign-built ships is accompanied with another provision that an equal amount of tonnage shall be built by the owners of the ships in our shipyards.

With the provisions that have been so carefully incorporated into the bill to equalize the difference, as he stated yesterday, between the cost of building and the cost of running, does the Senator think that without this provision for foreign-built ships there will not be in the next five years a very large addition to our marine of American-built ships? If he does, then the bill fails of its original purpose, and I want to call his attention to this point. I should like to have him state, because he has made himself master of this question, whether what is set forth in the memorial I have here is true:

We, the undersigned builders and owners of American vessels, respectfully petition that the provision for the admission to American registry of and payment of bounties to foreign-built vessels be stricken from the shipping bill now before Congress, being unqualifiedly opposed to the depletion of the United States Treasury in aid of foreign shipbuilders.

Accompanying that protest is a statement which perhaps the Senator has heard, and I should like to have him tell us whether he believes it is correct. The statement is that already, in view and expectation of the passage of this bill, parties who are urging this provision for foreign-built ships are engaged in building a great many ships in foreign yards which will come in and get the benefit of this bill the moment it passes. I am going to turn these papers over to my colleague, because I want him to have them before the Committee on Commerce to-morrow morning. They represent to me that the bounties that will be paid under the bill for the foreign-built ships which are now being constructed in view of the passage of this bill will amount to more than \$3,000,000.

Now, I do not think my colleague, who has most faithfully studied this question and who believes not in free ships, but in American-built ships, would urge upon the Senate the passage of a bill that would result in the great bulk of the subsidy being



turned over immediately to foreign-built ships. As I said, I am going to turn these papers over to him unless he already has copies of them, in order that when this matter comes up, as he indicates it will be up in the morning, before the Committee on Commerce it may be thoroughly looked into.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from Maine tell the Senate from what paper he has read?

Mr. HALE. I read from an original petition of shipbuilders, this particular one being signed, I should think, by forty or fifty, perhaps sixty, shipbuilders. Then accompanying that is a document giving the figures I have indicated of the amount that will be paid to these foreign-built ships, and in that reference is made to the report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1899, in which lists are given of these vessels now being constructed in foreign yards to come in and take this bounty as soon as the bill passes. That is a new feature to me, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. All that would be of interest to the entire Senate as well as the Committee on Commerce, and I hope the Senator from Maine will let it all be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MONEY. Now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Now.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to ask him for information whether or not these foreign-built ships, which he says are being built with a view of getting the advantage of this bounty, are to sail under the American flag by some act admitting them to registry?

Mr. HALE. The provisions of the bill cover that.

Mr. MONEY. They do?

Mr. HALE. They are admitted to the privileges of our flag.

Mr. MONEY. How does that encourage American shipbuilding?

Mr. HALE. The Senator can answer that better than I.

Mr. MONEY. I will ask the Senator to do so.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the document referred to by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD. It contains information which would be valuable to the entire Senate.

Mr. FRYE. I do not regard it as of any particular value.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Before the Senator proceeds, may I ask the senior Senator from Maine if the document referred to by him will be printed?

Mr. HALE. I have not got this in form. I have the big document here. I do not know what I should want to put in.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not refer to the report of the Commissioner. All I ask for is for the printing of the document from which the Senator from Maine quoted.

Mr. FRYE. I think Senators opposed to the bill will be flooded with all such documents before the debate is closed.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have this printed now.

Mr. FORAKER. I should like to ask, if the Senator from Maine will state it, what is the amount of the tonnage referred to in the communication he has?

Mr. HALE. It says:

The International Navigation Company, for example, is now completing in English yards 44,000 tons of high-class steamships (the *Zeeland*, *Haverford*, *Merion*, and one not yet named), and these results of the expenditure of millions of American money in foreign yards will be ready to begin drawing American bounties as soon as this bill becomes law.

Mr. FRYE. It is not true at all.

Mr. HALE. That is what I want the Senator to state to the Senate.

Mr. FRYE. Under the provisions of the bill they can not draw a cent of bounty until after they have built an equal amount of tonnage in American shipyards.

Mr. HALE. The provision is that the money shall be held in the Treasury until they build the ships.

Mr. FRYE. Until they build the ships; and, so far as I know, there are now two freight ships of 20,000 tons each building in American yards, the largest ships ever built in the world, which will come under the provisions of this bill undoubtedly, and ought to come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HALE. They are being built here.

Mr. FRYE. In American shipyards.

Mr. TELLER. Where?

Mr. FRYE. New London, Conn.

Mr. HALE. They ought to come in.

Mr. FRYE. Of course they ought to come in, and my judgment is that this foreign tonnage referred to here ought to come in to enable us within five years to have a respectable and encouraging fleet of our own to carry our commerce abroad. We have about 800,000 tons, or a little more than that, now. You admit 300,000 tons from abroad. They must build 300,000 tons here. That gives us 600,000 tons of first-class ships, which, added to your 800,000, makes 1,400,000 tons. Add to that 300,000 tons, built in your own country, and you are getting a very respectable carrying fleet for our country under the provisions of this bill.

If you simply call upon the United States to furnish these vessels, under the provisions of the bill they are required to furnish only 25 per cent more of tonnage for each vessel that receives pay

under the provisions of the bill, and you would be ten or fifteen or twenty years in getting what would be an encouraging fleet of vessels, which would be an inducement to others to invest their capital in this sort of business. American capital has been slow and will be slow to invest. It has been investing in railroads and all that sort of thing. You can not hire a dollar here on ship security short of 6 per cent a year.

The International Line go to Great Britain, build a ship there, and hire for 3½ per cent interest. They must pay in this country 6 per cent. Why? Because we have been entirely out of the habit of having anything to do with ships on the ocean, and we must induce Americans to take an interest in this kind of investment. My judgment is that the building of \$40,000,000 worth of ships in our own shipyards, doubling their capacity, and more, too, will attract the attention of American capital, and that we will go on and make the bill ultimately a profound success. That is what I am after. It will not be a success—that is, you will not get fleet enough to carry all your exports in the next five years or ten years.

I desire a bill which, through its provisions, shall in twenty or thirty years place us on the ocean where we legitimately belong, carrying all our exports to all the foreign ports of the world. I said before the Senator interrupted me that I proposed to bring this matter to the attention of the Committee on Commerce tomorrow morning, not that we should decline to admit any foreign-built ships to American registry, for I do not believe in that, but in order that we may draft a provision by which there will be no guesswork whatever as to the amount of foreign-built ships which shall be registered in our country. I have already stated that the foreign-built ships are to receive only 50 per cent of the bounty.

Now, I wish to say right here that, being in favor of registering these ships, I have great fears that we will not succeed under the terms of the bill in doing it to any great extent. There is the Grace Line between New York and Chili, a valuable line to American commerce, owned entirely by American citizens—Mayor Grace, of New York. His son is engaged in business with him. He was over here two or three days ago, and informed me that they had investigated this subject with great care and that they could not afford under the terms of the bill to register their line of ships in America, and that they should not do it.

Mr. Baker, of the Atlantic Transport Company, told me a few days ago that he could not possibly, under the terms of the bill, register all of the ships in his line, because they get only 50 per cent, and, in his judgment, the whole amount paid here does no more than to equalize foreign and American ships.

Mr. HALE. That is the Atlantic Transport Company?

Mr. FRYE. Yes; the Atlantic Transport Company. The American Line informed me that at least ten of their ships would never be admitted to American registry; that about six, I think, or seven, under the terms of the bill, would be, and that the amount admitted would compel them to build \$14,000,000 worth of ships in our yards.

Section 11 requires an inspection of the foreign-built ships.

Section 14 requires all of these ships to—

carry on each foreign voyage as a member of the ship's company one American boy, under 21 years of age and suitable for such employment, for each 1,000 tons gross registered tonnage, which boys shall be taught in the duties of seamanship, or engineering, or other maritime knowledge, as the case may be, respectively, and receive such pay for their services as shall be reasonable.

Mr. HALE. What section is that?

Mr. FRYE. Section 14.

Mr. HALE. What page?

Mr. FRYE. Page 20. That, in the course of five years, if the bill was a reasonable success, would result in at least a thousand of our boys being trained and educated on shipboard.

Section 15 provides for the employment of these vessels as auxiliaries of the Navy under the usual terms. There is a proposed amendment at the close of this section.

Mr. TELLER. What print has the Senator? It is different from mine.

Mr. FRYE. This is the last print of Senate bill 727.

Mr. TELLER. The print of February 26?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is at the bottom of the page.

Mr. FRYE. The last clause of that section is a proposed amendment, as follows:

In case of any taking or employment as provided in this section the shipping obligations of the officers and crews existing at the time shall be deemed to have terminated.

Of course, such a provision was entirely unnecessary, but the seamen's attorney, who has been in Washington for the last ten years, in a published statement declared that the bill provided for the impressment of sailors, and that amendment was proposed to take from the bill all such fear.

Section 17 provides that all of these vessels when required shall carry the United States mails without pay, and furnish all the necessary accommodations, carrying messengers, and all that sort of thing.



Section 19 provides for a forfeiture in the event that the contracts upon the part of the ship contractors are not faithfully carried out.

I believe I have now said all I desire to say in relation to the bill.

Mr. FORAKER. If it will not interrupt the Senator from Maine, I should like, before he passes from his explanation of the bill, to call his attention to a criticism I have heard upon it, and I call the Senator's attention to it in order that he may make answer to it in connection with his remarks. As I understood the Senator to say a while ago, one of the apprehensions he has as to the operation of the bill is that it will not bring into American registry foreign-built ships to the extent that has been expected or contemplated, reciting some facts in that connection.

The criticism I have heard upon the bill would seem to be a proper one to be considered in that connection. It is that there is a limitation and restriction in the provisions of the bill as to the admission of foreign-built ships to American registry, of this character, namely, that none shall be admitted except only those which are foreign built and American owned at the time of the passage of the bill or at a date named in the bill, or such as are actually under construction, coming within that description, at the date named. It is contended by those who criticize the bill on that account that it stands in the way of the development of our merchant marine.

I call the Senator's attention to it because I have seen that repeatedly in the newspapers and because quite recently a gentleman from Boston, Mr. Henry W. Peabody, has been going about over the country making some addresses. He made one at Cincinnati and he made one at Chicago. I heard the one at Cincinnati, and this was the point upon which he particularly dwelt. It may be that the Senator on yesterday, when I had the misfortune to be absent from the Chamber, commented upon this point. If so, it is unnecessary for me to have him do so again; but if he has not paid particular attention to it, I should be glad if he would do so. While it does not trouble me particularly, I know it has troubled some people who are very warm friends of the proposition, stated generally, to restore the merchant marine.

Mr. FRYE. I have been all my public life contending against the doctrine of free ships. I fought most vigorously every proposition for rehabilitating our ships that were practically compelled to go under a foreign flag during the civil war. I never yielded until the dead failure of a subsidy bill, on which I had spent an immense amount of time and as to which, and an accompanying bounty bill, I had great hopes that they would, if they became law, be a great success, and that we would once more occupy the position such a nation as this ought to on the ocean.

When I found that it was a dead failure, caused by amendments without reason or rhyme, the proposition was made to admit the *New York and Paris*. First the proposition was made to admit the entire fleet, with an agreement that they would build corresponding tonnage in the United States. I finally consented to favor the admission of two of the best of their ships, with the agreement that they would complement them here with two more of like speed, etc. In that way we succeeded in having a line between our country and Europe by which, if we wished to go abroad, we could sail under the American flag, and it removed to some extent my prejudices and induced me in this measure, in my anxiety to have it a success as early as possible, for the reasons I stated just now, to consent to a certain fixed number of ships which should receive an American register.

I would not dare follow Mr. Henry Peabody. I have known him; I have heard all of his arguments; I have had all of his pamphlets; he has been before our committee; I know everything he says, and I do not at all yield my judgment to him in this matter. He is, I believe, a free-ship advocate. I do not myself pretend to have great knowledge of shipping affairs, but for twenty-five years my attention has been very largely absorbed in commercial questions, and especially in those relating to shipping, and I am happy to say that I never yet have reported from the Committee on Commerce a bill to the United States Senate touching ships that has not passed this body.

I regard that as a very great compliment to what little knowledge the Senate may think that I have about shipping matters. I do not believe in Mr. Peabody's proposition. I do not believe it would be safe or wise to adopt it. I believe it is the next thing to free ships. I do not suppose there ever will be, under this bill, another foreign-built ship admitted to American registry—

Mr. TELLER. How is that?

Mr. FRYE. I do not believe there will ever be another foreign-built ship admitted to our registry, if this bill becomes a law, other than those which are provided for in it.

Mr. TELLER. Oh! That is what I did not understand.

Mr. FRYE. I believe that the result, if this becomes a law, will be such a picture to the American people that with the enormous capital we have now in this country, with nothing hardly for it to invest itself in, it will flow toward the ships of

the ocean, where it has refused absolutely to go up to the present time.

Mr. TELLER. Why?

Mr. FRYE. Because their attention is drawn now largely away from the railroad investments and—

Mr. TELLER. What I meant to ask the Senator is why capital has refused to flow toward the building and running of ships?

Mr. FRYE. Because there was more money in other things. There was money in coastwise ships and lake ships and capital flowed thitherward freely.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask if it will not be necessary that we shall make some arrangement by which money can be made in building and running ships before money will flow there.

Mr. FRYE. The men who are building and running ships, and who ought to know, believe that under the provisions of the bill capital will go into the business to the full extent that it is needed. They believe that the bill will do what it professes to do—restore the American merchant marine to the ocean. They are willing to take their chances and to come under contracts to build this enormous amount of American tonnage. They know where they can get capital. They are willing to establish lines to South America and across the Pacific to the Orient. They know perfectly well that at any rate for three or four years it is to be one of the fiercest fights—I mean a commercial fight—that has been seen upon the ocean; that Germany and Great Britain and Norway and other countries are not going to surrender to us if they can help it.

You know perfectly well that when we subsidized the Collins Line Great Britain immediately doubled the subsidy to the Cunard Line, and the Collins Line in eight years was driven away from the ocean. That attempt is to be made here. But these men, who ought to know, and who are going to invest their money, are the men who are willing to take the risk of undertaking to restore the merchant marine under the conditions of this bill.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask, if the Senator will let me interrupt him, whether he does not think when that financial competition begins between the shipowners of Europe and the United States, and they double their subsidy, as he says they did, and as very likely they will, that they may drop their freight rates and their passage rates to such an extent as to make the investment unprofitable; and if these people will not then come here and ask us to double their subsidy too. Will we not be in the position of having induced them to go into it, so that they can appeal to us to give them a remuneration for their capital by giving them an additional subsidy; and are we not likely to get into a good deal of difficulty about this matter?

Mr. FRYE. We are not establishing in this bill, if the Senator please, one line from New York to Liverpool. We are hoping to establish lines to all the commercial ports of the whole world. When Great Britain had the Cunard line running between Liverpool and New York, and it was the only line there, and we put on a line which jeopardized it, she could well afford to double that subsidy. But when we are having lines running to all the commercial ports Great Britain will never dream of doubling the subsidies which she is paying now, and making them ten or fifteen million dollars instead of what she is paying to-day.

Our safety lies in that. It is in the multiplicity of the lines. If we under this bill were going to establish only one line, like the Collins, I should agree entirely with the Senator. They would drive us off the ocean; I have no doubt about it at all. But under the provisions of this bill, if it is successful, as we hope it will be, and as these gentlemen believe it will be, I have not any fear of that at all.

I said yesterday, and I fully believe it, that in less than three years the competition which will result on account of the provisions of this bill, if it becomes a law, will reduce freight rates across the ocean to the world 25 per cent. They can stand a 25 per cent reduction to-day on the Pacific. There is where the profits are made to-day in ship sailing and carrying freight.

Mr. TELLER. How about the Atlantic?

Mr. FRYE. On the Atlantic ships are carrying, or two years ago were carrying, as low as they could profitably; but these rates have increased very largely since the Spanish war.

Mr. HANNA. One hundred per cent.

Mr. FRYE. One hundred per cent. I understand. The withdrawal of so many ships, first by the United States for sea transport and collier service in the Spanish war and then by England of her transports for the Boer war, has made us short of ships. We were exporting coal, but we had to stop. The freights went to that extent of increase we could not afford to do it. That there will be a reduction of freight rates of 25 per cent in two or three years I have not the shadow of a doubt, and I argued yesterday that the producer would get the entire benefit of that reduction, while in a bounty paid to ships he will get absolutely nothing.

Mr. TELLER. The reduction that you prophesy is from present rates to 25 per cent?

Mr. FRYE. No; I prophesy it from the normal rates.

Mr. TELLER. The former rates?



Mr. FRYE. The former rates; the normal rates.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FRYE. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator.

Mr. MONEY. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to ask a question. He was asked if the English Government would not double the bounty in order to still further compete. The Senator replied that when they had a single line they could afford to do it; that when an American line was put on which jeopardized the interest of the Cunarders, then the British Government doubled its subsidy.

Mr. FRYE. It was the Collins Line.

Mr. MONEY. But the Cunard Line was threatened?

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. MONEY. The Collins Line was put on. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that the British Government discriminate in favor of some lines of their own against other lines of their own as well as of other nations, and to such an extent that they have even doubled the postage from the home countries to the Australian colonies on some lines in excess of that over others? They have not only continued these discriminations as to foreign ships but as to their own, and as a matter of fact they have charged doubled postage on a route over the postage on another route in order to build up a certain route. Of course, we are not going to follow the example of Great Britain in a matter of that sort.

Mr. FRYE. I am persuaded now that while the policy pursued by Great Britain, and commenced many and many years ago, was a good policy for her, establishing certain lines to her colonies and elsewhere and paying them large subsidies, and while I think that policy worked admirably for her, I do not think it would work well in this Republic.

I think the law here should give every man the same chance that any other man has. Any man who has money should be permitted to put it into a ship and establish a line if he pleases. Any corporation should be permitted to do it. Take our American Line from New York to Southampton. That receives \$750,000 a year for carrying the mails. It is a losing game for the ships. While the company receives that amount of money, and no other company could receive anything because the contract is with that company, of course you never will have another line established.

Under this bill there is the same invitation to all men and to all corporations. Nobody is selected as England selects them and then adjusts the subsidies as she pleases, as the Senator from Mississippi says. I know that she does it. I know when she wishes to establish a line in order to gain commercial opportunities in certain directions she will increase it, or if one is established she is satisfied and is inclined to let well enough alone.

Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senate for taking the time I did yesterday and have taken to-day in discussing this bill, and I thank Senators for the patience they have exercised and the attention they have given me. My only justification is my intense interest in this matter, the importance of the subject, and the wild and insane criticisms and misrepresentations which have been made about a bill of which the people who made them knew absolutely little or nothing.

The bill has not been sent over the country. It has been represented to the country as these foreign lines and their agents desire to represent it. No amendment has ever been alluded to. It has been talked about as the Hanna-Payne bill, which was introduced in the Senate two years ago. It has been changed in very many material particulars, seriously changed, too, and yet the same old criticisms and misrepresentations are repeated day in and day out about the Hanna-Payne bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Has it been improved?

Mr. FRYE. I think it has been improved decidedly. I beg the Senate's pardon for talking so long.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Maine need apologize for the speech that he has made. I think that he might go on and help us out in some features of this difficulty. I followed the Senator very carefully, and I do not see that he has really told us what is the cause of the decadence of American shipping. If he has done so, I was at lunch for a few moments and lost it. Now, that is what I want to know. If I knew the cause, I should think I knew something about the remedy; but I have been unable to find any adequate cause for the decadence which began, I think, about 1860 or 1861.

I know the Senator from Maine has given a great deal of attention to this matter, and I should like, either now or at some time while he is speaking, to have him tell us, if he can, what are the difficulties. He told us yesterday that we had removed several obstacles, which we have done, as I know, and yet the decadence continued; it was rather accelerated, I think, after the effort which was made in some way.

I should like to have his opinion on that question either now or at some time before the debate is over. I join with him in the desire to restore the American marine. I have not got a bit of en-

couragement from what the Senator has said. Really it seemed to me, after he got through, as if he had put us in a position where we have to bolster up this business for all time or else the decadence is to go on. If I knew that that was so, I should not vote for this bill. If that is to be the case, I am not going to vote for it.

Mr. FRYE. The bill provides that no contract shall be made after ten years.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that; but what is the use of our attempting to establish the American marine for twenty years and then go back? They will come to us then and say, "Why, we built these ships, and you must keep us afloat." Are we to do that always? I believe we will do it always until we find out what the difficulty is. If it is a difficulty which can not be overcome except by subsidy, let us accept the situation and say that for some reason we are denied the privilege of carrying our products abroad in our own ships, as we did carry them to the extent of 75 per cent from our earliest infancy clear up to 1860 and 1861.

Mr. FORAKER. Ninety per cent.

Mr. TELLER. It was 90 per cent at one time, but when the decadence began we were carrying 75 per cent of all our imports and exports in our own ships.

Now, that is what I want the Senator to address himself to, if he will. I do not care if he takes two or three days to do it. I believe it would be profitable for us if he could give us any information on that subject.

Mr. FRYE. I could repeat one of my old speeches on ships and the decline in shipping, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] could repeat one of his old ones on free ships. There would not be the slightest difficulty about it. I could do it now, but in my remarks yesterday (I do not know that the Senator heard me; I doubt if he did) I think that I gave very directly and distinctly my opinion as to what the cause was.

Now, what I have said will be published to-morrow morning in the RECORD, and if the Senator is not at all satisfied, later on in this debate, when I have heard from the opposition, I shall be very happy to indulge, if the Senate will permit me, in some more remarks on the shipping question. But I would rather not do it now.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] reminds me of a very learned lecture delivered by the late John Roach, the celebrated American shipbuilder, in which he undertook to compare the cause of the decline of American shipping and shipbuilding, and used a very splendid Irish bull. He said that the civil war and the discovery that iron was better than wood was the twin mother of the decay of the American marine. That bull carried as much of truth in it as it did of wit; and it was very nearly the exact truth at the time he uttered it, which was about eighteen years ago.

Since that time, however, we have got in the habit of exporting iron to Great Britain, and we have in one locality that I have in mind iron of the best quality of ore, coal of the finest kind, unlimited quantities of both, and the limestone for the flux, all in such juxtaposition that it seems that nature intended to make us the cheapest producer of iron in the world. We are not only selling steel rails to the North, but we are selling iron to England, and we are selling iron all over the world. I think that Mr. Cramp, if I am not very much mistaken, admitted some year or two ago that he could build a ship as cheap as it could be built anywhere in the world.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not want to defeat this bill, but I want to challenge the statement, if I may, so that the Senator may look it up, that there is a difference between the cost of building a ship in the United States and Great Britain of 25 per cent. I know that as long as six or eight years ago the shipbuilders of this country declared that there was not to exceed the difference of 10 per cent. Since that time there has been a very great reduction in the price of iron, if we go back to the normal condition. Perhaps just now that may not be the case, but the rise in iron is probably temporary. However, there has been a rise in iron and steel, of course in Europe as well as here. I believe that to-day all the material which goes into a ship of iron can be produced in the United States cheaper than in any other place in the world. The timber that goes in is certainly cheaper here than it is in any other place in the world, and all the material you may say that goes into a ship ought to be produced and is produced in the United States as cheap as anywhere else.

Mr. FRYE rose.

Mr. TELLER. But it is possible that there is some difference in the labor.

Mr. FRYE. I was going to ask the Senator what percentage of the first-class ships is the material.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose the labor is, of course, the larger cost.

Mr. FRYE. But what percentage of the entire cost of the ship is the material itself?

Mr. TELLER. I do not know about that.

Mr. FRYE. It is only 45 per cent. That is where the trouble comes in.



Mr. TELLER. I know labor enters largely into it, and there is probably some difference there.

Mr. FRYE. There is the trouble; it is in the labor.

Mr. TELLER. But if the statement the Senator from Mississippi made is true, that they declared they could build them as cheap here in a few years as they could in Europe, there can not be that difference. However, if that difference exists now it will continue to exist, undoubtedly, and that is one of the difficulties we shall have to meet. In my judgment, the greatest difficulty that we meet with in running American ships is what the Senator himself presented, which I know of no way to avoid, and that is that we can not hire American seamen for the same rate that other countries hire theirs.

Until conditions change in that respect, or we assume the position that we are going to level up by subsidy the difference between the labor in foreign countries, or the cheapest labor and ours, as well as the difference in the cost of building ships, this condition is going to exist until money gets cheaper in this country than in Europe. When it does that, I suppose capital will turn its attention to ships. A Senator in front of me says it is cheaper now. At times undoubtedly it is. There is plenty of money here to build ships. There is not any question about it. We do not want to go abroad to seek investment, and will not, simply because it does not pay. We will not put money there, because it does not pay.

Now, if we can find some way to make shipping pay without a subsidy, and I do not know but that we can, that is the thing we ought to do. If we could give shipping some preferentials, some advantages that we do not give to everybody else, that we did give for many years in our history, I believe we could return to some of the old conditions; perhaps not entirely, for we had 90 per cent; but we could at least increase the number of ships carrying our flag abroad.

I can not for myself feel very kindly disposed toward this present proposition, although I am willing to say that if I believed it would bring a return within a reasonable time with a reasonable outlay of money I should not object to it. That is all I want to be convinced of. I am not at the present time convinced that that will be the case.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 6, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 5, 1900.*

##### ASSISTANT SURGEONS, MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Louis P. H. Bahrenburg, of Ohio, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Bahrenburg is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John S. Boggess, of the District of Columbia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Boggess is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John T. Burkhalter, of Maryland, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Burkhalter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON, MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Leland E. Cofer, of Virginia, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Cofer is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Samuel D. Dickinson, of New Jersey, to be assistant collector of customs at Jersey City, N. J., in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed Michael I. Fagen, removed.

##### ASSISTANT SURGEONS, MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Edward Francis, of Ohio, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, in place of S. R. Tabb, deceased. Mr. Francis is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

George W. McCoy, of Tennessee, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. McCoy is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Claude C. Pierce, of Tennessee, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Pierce is

now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Benjamin S. Warren, of Washington, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Warren is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick S. Stratton, of California, to be collector of customs for the district of San Francisco, in the State of California, in place of John P. Jackson, deceased. Mr. Stratton is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

Walter T. Merrick, of Pennsylvania, to be naval officer of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, to succeed James B. Holland, resigned. Mr. Merrick is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### GENERAL APPRAISER.

Marion De Vries, of California, to be general appraiser of merchandise, in place of William D. Bynum, failed of confirmation. Mr. De Vries is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### MEMBERS OF INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

Charles H. Litchman, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Industrial Commission authorized by the act of Congress approved June 18, 1898, to succeed M. D. Ratchford, resigned. Mr. Litchman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Daniel A. Tompkins, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Industrial Commission authorized by the act of Congress approved June 18, 1898, to succeed Ellison A. Smythe, resigned. Mr. Tompkins is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Roy H. Chamberlain, of Iowa, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii, to succeed William Haywood, resigned.

##### ASSAYER.

Benjamin H. Tatem, of Montana, to be assayer in charge of the United States assay office at Helena, Mont., to succeed Eugene B. Braden, resigned.

##### SUPERINTENDENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Otto H. Tittmann, of Missouri, to be Superintendent of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, to succeed Henry S. Pritchett, resigned. Mr. Tittmann is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

John W. Yerkes, of Kentucky, to be collector of internal revenue for the Eighth district of Kentucky, to succeed John W. Yerkes, resigned. Mr. Yerkes is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

##### ASSISTANT AGENT.

Abram D. Harlan, of Pennsylvania, to be assistant agent at the salmon fisheries in Alaska, to succeed W. S. Ballard, resigned. Mr. Harlan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 5, 1900.*

##### FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

William M. Johnson, of New Jersey, to be First Assistant Postmaster-General.

##### CONSUL-GENERAL.

W. Irvin Shaw, of Pennsylvania, to be consul-general of the United States at Singapore, Straits Settlements.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 5, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

##### COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair makes the following announcement: Mr. SHAW of New York to be a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



## COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state to the House that he has received a communication from Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine, or his family, resigning his place as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; and, without objection and with the consent of the House, that resignation will be approved. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

## ARMY BILL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Rules to submit the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred House Resolution No. 306, has had the same under consideration and herewith report the following substitute therefor:

Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and consider Senate bill 4300, "An act increasing the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States;" this rule not to interfere with other special orders.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, under existing law the Army on the 30th day of next June will consist of only about 26,000 men, or less than one-half of the number that are now at Manila. It is perfectly apparent, therefore, to every one that legislation of some character must be had with respect to Army reorganization. We are advised by the War Department that there is necessity for haste. It takes some considerable time to recruit a new army and to get it ready for action, hence this rule. It will be observed that the rule simply provides for consideration of the bill, leaving to the judgment of the House the time to be occupied by general debate and the time to be occupied in debate under the five-minute rule. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] ten minutes, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we recognize the fact, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that it may be necessary that there shall be some legislation with respect to the Army, but we do not agree with him that this bill ought to become law. The bill that we are called upon to consider is a bill which is intended to provide a permanent military establishment for this country, a military establishment, Mr. Speaker, which is to exist permanently, in time of profound peace. If you say that we are not in a state of profound peace to-day, then this bill ought not to pass, for it does not contain the remedy for present conditions. We ought to consider this bill, or any bill providing a permanent military establishment, as if we were considering it in time of peace, because that is the natural condition of the United States.

In legislating for the Army, when we consider a bill making a standing army, we ought to legislate as if we were legislating for our country upon a permanent peace basis, not an emergency. If an emergency exists, as intimated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it ought not to be dealt with in this bill, or any bill making a permanent military establishment. This, in brief, is the position we take on this side of the House. We are opposed to this bill because of a number of its provisions. I can not attempt in the few moments that I shall discuss it to refer to all the obnoxious features. The first and fundamental objection to this bill is that it provides a standing army of not less than 58,000, speaking in general numbers, nor more than 100,000.

There is a margin, Mr. Speaker, of 42,000 men that this bill provides for or allows in the permanent military establishment of the country. Whether you are to have a standing army of 58,000 or 100,000 depends upon the option of one man. I care not how able, or patriotic, or good that man may be, nor whoever he may be, I am not willing to say any one man ought to control in a matter of that importance. It is the duty of Congress, Mr. Speaker, to say what the standing Army of the United States shall be. We have not the right to abdicate our powers in a matter of so grave importance as this. We ought not to leave it optional with any man—and I say it in no disparagement of the gentleman now in the Executive Mansion, but I would not be willing to leave it to any man to say whether we shall have permanently 58,000, 100,000, or any number between those two numbers. Congress should say exactly how many men the standing Army shall consist of, and that number, Mr. Speaker, ought to be fixed with the idea that it is permanent and not an emergency, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

I undertake to say that this country has never fought her battles with a standing army. There is patriotism enough left in the country now, and always will be, I trust, to fight our battles with volunteers. That is the way we managed to get along successfully in the most stupendous war of modern times. We did not depend on the Regular Army then. The Regular Army in existence when we had two million and a half soldiers in the field in the greatest war of modern times was not equal to the standing Army that we propose now in this bill to create for the Government of the United States. I am opposed to it for that reason, I am opposed to it for the other reason mentioned, and still other reasons which I will not now take time to discuss.

I say, Mr. Speaker, upon the question of a permanent army at this time, it is not necessary to deal with it now; but if I am mistaken in this, and if there is an emergency upon us, let us provide for it with volunteers. I am willing to give the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army, every dollar and every man necessary to put down rebellion against the established authority anywhere and everywhere, but I am opposed to putting a provision for an emergency into a bill intended to provide a permanent military establishment. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the bill as brought before the House for consideration under this rule does not purport to be a bill for the continuation of the Philippine army in the Philippine Islands or to strengthen the Executive to carry on that war, but it is a bill brought here to establish a permanent army in the United States, no matter what may be the ultimate condition or ownership of those islands. The bill itself contemplates that it may not be necessary for the police force of this country. It carries on its very face the fact that it can be reduced to 58,000 men.

Now, what does that demonstrate? This bill does not receive its birth in the House of Representatives. It comes here under the approval of the Secretary of War; it comes here vouched for by the Executive of this nation. Does that mean that the Executive of the National Government mistrusts the legislative body of this country, and believes that a time may come when the legislative portion of the Government, the Congress of the United States, will not respond with men in order to maintain the dignity and preserve the peace of this country? For what other reason can this sliding scale be put in this bill? There has never been a time in the history of the Government of the United States, from its very foundation up to the present hour, when the Executive of the country called on the Congress for men to sustain the flag and uphold the Government that the Congress has not responded. And why should we in this day and hour be met at the very beginning of this legislation with the distrust of the representatives of the people of the United States—a distrust believing that the men here on the floor of this House, who represent the people of the country, would not respond and provide a sufficient army to protect and maintain peace in this country if conditions require it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] such time as he may require.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a moment of time in the history of this country, from the days of George Washington down to the present time, when we did not have a standing army. The word "standing army" is not a scarecrow to the people of the United States. They have heard that word a good deal during the last four or five months, and they seem to have lived and got along very well up to the present time. There has never been a question, until it was made here this morning, in opposition to a standing army. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] understand that that is an open question in the history of the United States? George Washington provided us, with the instrumentalities of his mighty influence, with a standing army more than four times greater per capita to the people of the United States than is proposed in this bill, and that army was maintained until the days of Jefferson, when it was reduced, and at that time, under the reduction which Jefferson made, the standing army was twice greater than is proposed under this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Ohio will allow me to say that he did not understand what I stated. I stated that under this bill there is provided for the first time a sliding scale whereby the Executive and not the Congress of the United States can regulate how many men shall be in the Regular Army.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a play upon terms to say there is a sliding scale in this proposition. For myself, and speaking, as I believe, in behalf of the sentiment of a majority, a very large majority, of the people of the United States, I would favor a permanent establishment of 100,000 men. The people of this country are not frightened when a demagogue says that the Army is to be located at places where they can suppress labor riots. The people of the United States are not frightened by the cry of the demagogue who undertakes to make citizens of a Republic, such as we have, fearful of the subversion of their liberties. The "sliding scale" is simply this: It is proposed to authorize the President of the United States, when a proper emergency shall arise, to fill up the skeleton companies from 60 to the maximum of 100 men. Is not that in line with the duties of the Chief Magistrate of the country?

I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee to this fact: The President of the United States has had power from the foundation of the Government down to the present time to use the Army of the country practically without limitation except in the law of the land, with a broad discretion given to him under all circumstances as to when, where, and how he shall use the



Army. Is it a great deviation from the established policy of the Government to give the President also this discretionary power as to the number of men to be enlisted when already he has the discretionary power as to the use of the men of the Army? And let it be said to the glory of the American Republic—going back to its foundation and coming down through all the exigencies of party change—there never was a time when the President of the United States made use of that power which has been given to him to the discredit of his office or the disturbance of the happiness and peace of the country. Only on one or two or three occasions from the foundation of the Government down has this discretion ever been used. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is no record of the public acts of men in the United States that discloses such hesitancy, such unwillingness, such a determination not to act, as is shown in the whole record of the President's action in the matter of the troops.

There is one great, magnificent act to the credit of Grover Cleveland that will stamp upon his Administration, even under the condemnation of his own party, a glory that will always shine—when, upon the advice of his Attorney-General, he assumed authority to keep the peace and protect property in a Commonwealth of this Republic, when the governor not only did not call for it, but protested against it. And in that instance, and perhaps in two others, you have the whole history of the intervention by the Executive through the agency of the armed forces of the United States in the matter of suppressing riots or anything of that character.

Now, then, I take it for granted that we must have a new organization of the Army. While the voice of the country is still echoing in the ears of our friends on the other side, I do not believe that they are willing that the armed forces of the United States shall be cut down to 25,000 men on the 1st day of next July. And I do not believe that the gentleman from Tennessee is in earnest when he talks about a volunteer force to meet an exigency such as is claimed we have at our doors to-day. For how long a time would the gentleman enlist that volunteer force; and what would he do with it after he got it? Would he send a volunteer regiment organized for one year over to the Philippines, or would he not himself—party politics being entirely excluded from his judgment—would he not organize a force sufficient for the present emergency, but looking forward to the possibility that a greater force might be demanded?

We had at the beginning of the Spanish war something like 20,000 available troops. We organized under the votes of this House a force of 250,000 men. That force in that emergency would have been equalled by the presence in an armed organization of 50,000 regular troops of, say, two years' service. And if we had had 50,000 regular troops we would have saved away up into a host of millions of money that we expended on that volunteer force. The gentleman will understand—he does understand as well as I do—the impossibility of suddenly meeting such an emergency by an organization of volunteer troops.

A gentleman sitting near me to-day, who had some experience during the war, has said to me—and I think he has said exactly what we all believe—that if the old United States, the United States under the unamended Constitution, had had, on the day of the first Bull Run, 50,000 regular soldiers, officered by loyal men, favorable to the upholding of the Union, the rebellion would not have lasted thirty days following the memorable 2d day of July, 1861.

Mr. HOPKINS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. Does not the gentleman think that if in the war of 1812 we had had a regular army, our Capitol would not have been burned?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no doubt of that. Proud as I am of the record of the volunteer soldiery, proud as I am of the little participation that I had the honor to have in those great events, I yet recognize what I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee will duly appreciate, that volunteer regiments, organized under the most favorable circumstances, are absolutely worthless in a great emergency until they have been at least one year in the field under competent organization and competent officers.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio will permit an interruption, I wish to suggest to him that volunteers in our Army are enlisted for a period of two years. Now you enlist men in the Regular Army for a period of three years, and I fail to find any necessity for making such a radical change as the bill proposes, or why we can not secure sufficient efficiency in the Army by the two-year enlistment plan in place of the three years now proposed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, by the time the volunteer regiments have served one or two years, under proper officers, they would become, practically, regular troops, I would state in answer to the gentleman.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then let me see if I understand the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. If he insists

that an emergency exists at the present time—and I suppose he refers to the condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands—if he insists that an emergency requires an army of 100,000 men for the country, then I would like to have that clearly stated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I will say very frankly to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not know anything about it. I know no more than he does about it. That is one of the few things that the gentleman from Tennessee and myself put together know nothing about. [Laughter.]

But it is well enough to provide for any emergency, and to provide this small army of 100,000 men if it should be necessary to use them. It is well enough to have the machinery provided by law for such organization if we should need it. And I say to the gentleman from Tennessee, what I believe he will reecho, that I have no fear, and I think that he has none, that the present President of the United States, or any other President of the United States who may succeed him, will blur, blot, disgrace, or obscure the magnificent record which has been made by their predecessors in that high office.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let me ask the gentleman from Ohio another question. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] stated that there was never a time in the history of the country when the President of the United States had the discretion which you now propose to confer upon him, of using a sliding scale with reference to the number of troops in the Regular Army. Now, I ask the gentleman from Ohio whether that is true or not. Was there ever a time in the history of the country when the President of the United States had, in respect to the military establishment, absolute discretion to increase or decrease the standing army at will?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that there never was a time when the President of the United States did not have the power to use the sliding scale.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then let the gentleman point out the law.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will give us full information upon the point that he has just suggested.

Mr. GROSVENOR. So far as the gentleman from Alabama is concerned, his statement is radically wrong and is precisely the reverse of the facts.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Then will the gentleman from Ohio point to the law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have stated that there was no law which authorized an increase or diminution of the Army at the will of the President; and I challenge the gentlemen from Ohio to point to any such law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am going to do so as I proceed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (continuing). I ask him to show any law which authorizes the President of the United States to increase or diminish the Army at will. Of course, I know that he would have discretion to enlist men up to the full number authorized by law; but I ask the gentleman to point to any statute of the United States which authorizes an increase or diminution of the Army at the will of the President.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The point of the gentleman from Alabama as to the finding of the law which authorized this practice is, of course, well taken. The law covers the statute books of the country during all our history.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is precisely what I stated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But, let me continue, the very fact of the organization of an army in the United States necessarily gives the President power of administering the sliding scale with reference to the number of troops, as I have stated. The present organization of a regiment of infantry, for instance, authorizes the formation of three battalions of four companies each and 100 men to each company. There is no law that compels the President of the United States to maintain that maximum up to 100 men in a company, and in practice it has not been the case. Practically, no Administration in time of profound peace would maintain the maximum of the companies at 100 men each, although authorized by the law. The only difference between the action of the long line of Presidents and the uniform policy of the Government heretofore with the present bill, now pending before the House, is to give to the President of the United States by law a right which has been exercised practically heretofore to increase the Army above the maximum of 58,000 men in case of necessity. So that the power has always been there, and if it was a dangerous power it has always been in the hands of the President; and my point is that it has never been used to the injury of the Republic nor the disgrace of the Army or the country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, if the gentleman will allow me for a moment, I wish to call his attention to the fact that so far as the skeleton companies were concerned that existed before the Spanish war, it took the legislation of Congress to fill those companies, and the only place where any question of a sliding scale came in was where the Executive allowed the enlistments to fall below the



number of men authorized by Congress, and that was only a temporary matter of a few months until the enlistments were picked up again; but it was not an authorized act.

Mr. GROSVENOR. My point is this: Practically there has always been a sliding scale in the matter of the minimum and the maximum of the Army. I assert that it has never been misused or abused by the President; and, furthermore, with regard to this bill, I assert that it is not any derogation of the principle and policy upon which the Government has hitherto always acted.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I now ask for the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, before going into the bill, I should like to know if we can not arrange some time when general debate may be closed, and when we may proceed to the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman from Iowa will agree to two hours on a side, and then that the bill shall be taken up under the five-minute rule, with general leave to print for ten days, the time on that side to be controlled by the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the time on this side to be controlled by myself.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to agree to that proposition, that the general debate shall continue for two hours on a side, the time to be controlled equally, as suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] proposes that general debate be limited to two hours on a side on this bill, after which discussion under the five-minute rule shall be proceeded with, with general leave to print for ten days, the time on the Republican side to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and the time on the Democratic side to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER]. Is there objection to this arrangement?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, there is a special order set for to-morrow—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, before the discussion begins, I desire to give notice that at the proper time I shall offer a substitute for the majority report.

The SPEAKER. That will be in order at the proper time.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, there is a special order for to-morrow. That special order was made some months ago, and I hope by agreement it may be set down to follow this bill. We hope to pass the bill to-morrow if we can have the opportunity to continue the consideration of it. I ask unanimous consent that what is called the oleo bill—I really do not know the number of it—made the special order for to-morrow, may be made the special order to follow the passage of this Army bill; that the special order setting the oleo bill down for to-morrow may be vacated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, pending the granting of unanimous consent, I should like, as a member of the Agricultural Committee, to have it definitely understood when the oleo bill is to be taken up, and how much time for debate is to be granted.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I understand it, Friday is private bill day and Monday is District of Columbia day. I simply mention that fact. I am not particular as to the day on which the oleo bill shall be taken up, but I want it settled on what day it is to be taken up before the granting of unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that if this request is granted, providing that the oleomargarine bill shall immediately follow the disposition of this bill, and the consideration of it be continued until it is disposed of, there can be no misapprehension.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is understood, then.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry. Pending that request, I desire to know, if the request was denied, if the military bill would displace the oleomargarine bill, and if it should fail to be taken up to-morrow, if it would lose its place as a special order.

The SPEAKER. A second assignment can not displace a first assignment or first special order.

Mr. DALZELL. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that there is a clause in the rule that saves the oleomargarine bill its place.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I did not attend the meeting of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that even without that rule the first order would not be displaced.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. As I understand the request of the gentleman from Iowa, it provides positively that a vote shall be taken upon the military bill to-morrow?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no. I said "I hoped" to have a vote to-morrow.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. You "hoped." I do not want to have any understanding that we are to fix a time to take a vote on the military bill before reading it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HULL. My understanding is that general debate is to run for two hours on a side—four hours; and that then the bill is to be considered under the five-minute rule; and I hoped by proper attention to business that we may conclude the consideration of the bill to-morrow without much doubt, and have a vote on it before we adjourn to-morrow.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Following my parliamentary inquiry, the only result of an objection to this request will be, then, to simply lay the military bill aside and begin the consideration of the oleomargarine bill to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. And to be continued until completed.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Yes. Well, nothing can be gained by that, and therefore I have no objection to the request. I would like to object to that bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the Military Committee occupied a portion of to-morrow in the consideration of this bill, and the order of the House was by unanimous consent that we commence immediately the consideration of the Grout bill, to be continued until concluded, would that displace the special order for Friday, or the rule in regard to the District of Columbia on Monday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would. The Chair will state the request of the gentleman from Iowa, as he understands it. The gentleman asks that the special order made for December 6, for the consideration of House bill 8717, be so modified that it will be postponed until the disposition of the Army reorganization bill, the one which has just been passed upon by the House, and then that this special order on the bill just referred to will be taken up immediately and that the consideration thereof shall continue until that is disposed of. Is that the request of the gentleman?

Mr. HULL. That is the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I want to ask if it is intended to modify the rule already adopted at the first session of this Congress for the consideration of the Grout bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. That will be the effect of it, whether the intention or not.

Mr. PAYNE. How will it be?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I do not want to tie our hands any tighter than they are.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if he does not think it possible to conclude this bill in three hours to-morrow?

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to make any determination of that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], representing gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, in talking with me this morning, said he had no question but what we could conclude the bill to-morrow; but whether we conclude the bill to-morrow or not depends upon the action of the House. I shall myself quicken that all I can without being unfair to any parties who desire to be heard.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota if I understand him to say that if this request for unanimous consent be given that it will place the oleomargarine bill in a position that it does not now get under the rule?

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Minnesota's inquiry was as to the beginning of the discussion or consideration of that bill. It merely postpones the consideration of it until the conclusion of the consideration of the military bill.

Mr. DALZELL. And does not affect it in any other way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not desire to object to the consideration of this request if it does not affect the oleomargarine bill; and I make this parliamentary inquiry—whether this unanimous consent now asked will give to the oleomargarine bill a place on the Calendar that it would not have under the rule already adopted?

The SPEAKER. That is a question that the Chair would be unwilling to decide at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because if it does, I am constrained to object. I am unwilling to give that bill a position by unanimous consent that it could not otherwise have occupied under the rules, and to such a request for unanimous consent I desire to object.

The SPEAKER. It is a question, the Chair will state, whether under this rule more than one day can be given to the consideration of the oleomargarine bill. That is a question that the Chair does not desire to decide.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand, the request for unanimous consent covers merely the completion of the Army bill, and on the completion of that the oleomargarine bill comes up precisely as it does now under the special order.

Mr. DALZELL. I understand that, Mr. Speaker, was practically the request of the gentleman from Iowa.



Mr. HULL. My understanding was that this oleomargarine bill would come up to-morrow and occupy the time until completed, and we wanted to displace it for the time being, provided that we did not displace it altogether.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, why can not we take up the military bill to-day and to-morrow take up the oleomargarine bill, in accordance with the special order, and then let the military bill, partly finished, follow that?

The SPEAKER. That will be the order, unless unanimous consent is given.

Mr. HOPKINS. I think that is the better way to dispose of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Illinois to object.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. If this request—

The SPEAKER. Will the House please be in order? An effort is being made to reach an agreement, and that can not be done unless the House is in order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, let me modify my request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HENRY] has the floor.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I want to make an inquiry. No one cares to antagonize the Army bill. We are all in favor of it, at least on this side of the House; but gentlemen representing the Agricultural Committee are anxious to know how it will affect the special order for to-morrow. We have a special order for one day only; and now if we agree to this request of the chairman of the Military Committee, can we have time on Friday? As I understand, there is a general order giving the Committee on Claims the first Friday of each month. Now, if we agree to this request of the chairman of the Military Committee, can the oleomargarine bill have the right of way on Friday?

The SPEAKER. The oleomargarine bill has the right of way on Friday under the order previously made.

Mr. GROUT. It is assigned for Thursday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair intended to say Thursday.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] that, in order to obviate this trouble, we let the consideration of the oleomargarine bill begin on Monday next.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I propose to object to any unanimous consent that includes the oleomargarine bill. If that is not included in the request, I shall not object.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, what is the request that is made for unanimous consent? I was not on the floor at the time.

The SPEAKER. The latest request is that made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], namely, that the special setting of the oleomargarine bill on the 6th—Thursday of this week—be changed to Monday of next week, reserving the same rights, no more and no less, that it now possesses.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Under the order of the House, the House now resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Army reorganization bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union, with Mr. DALZELL in the chair, for the consideration of the Army reorganization bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 4300, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 4300. An act to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the result of the action of the Committee on Military Affairs is to present an Army bill going both to the line and staff of the Army and making a permanent establishment for the United States. It does not make a permanent establishment of 96,000 men. It really creates a permanent establishment in round numbers of 58,000 men, eighteen thousand and some hundreds being in the artillery branch of the service, and in that branch it provides that but 20 per cent of the increased number provided for the artillery, something over ten thousand men, shall be recruited from year to year for a period of five years, so that at the present establishment, if there are no exigencies demanding a larger force, a permanent establishment of the United States by this bill would be at less than fifty thousand men. And when the bill works out its full provisions during the next five years for the permanent establishment of the force provided in the bill, exclusive of the artillery, for all other branches

of the service is less than forty thousand men, so that the talk of a great army is not well advised.

The bill does provide for 96,000 men at this time.

Section 31 is as follows:

That the President is authorized to maintain the enlisted force of the several organizations of the Army at their maximum strength as fixed by this act during the present exigencies of the service, or until such time as Congress may hereafter direct.

This gives the maximum in the bill now—authorizes the President to enlist the full number. He can reduce the Army or Congress can act at any time.

In other words, Congress next year, if it shall determine that the Army shall be reduced, has the absolute power to say whether the additional men shall be maintained or not, and it would have that power without this provision in the bill. It gives no additional power to us and it takes nothing from it. During our entire history the Regular Army has been the subject of constant legislation. And there has never been a question but that we, the representatives of the people, have the right, at any session, to determine whether the Army is greater or less than the needs of the country demand.

This bill in its organization lines follows practically the same lines of organization adopted by this House on two separate occasions. It does give battalion commissioned officers where the first bill passed by the House did not. It gives a commissary and quartermaster combined for each battalion, in addition to what was given by the original House bill passed two years ago. Outside of that, it is practically the organization passed upon favorably by this House on two separate occasions.

And, Mr. Chairman, the only criticism that I have heard on the bill, so far as it relates to the line, is with regard to the fact that the proportion of cavalry regiments is larger than ordinarily obtains in the organization of an army. The bill gives fifteen cavalry regiments to thirty regiments of infantry. There is this reason for that, which influenced the minds of a majority of the committee, that the different States of the Union, in their militia organizations, do not provide cavalry organizations. They can multiply the infantry regiments almost without number in every crisis. And there is the further reason that in the operations in the Philippine Islands cavalry will be more useful in scouting the country, in suppressing lawlessness, and in overcoming the brigands that now infest the islands than would infantry regiments. These are the arguments that have induced the committee to recommend fifteen regiments of cavalry, as provided in this bill.

The main contest in the committee and before the country has been in regard to the staff organization of the Army. Members of the House are familiar with the recommendations of the present Secretary of War in favor of an unlimited detail of staff and changing what is now the fixed or permanent staff into one of detail in nearly all of the departments of the Army, making even the chiefs of the staff corps a matter of detail. So far as I am concerned I can see no special harm in a detailed staff applying only to the military branches of the Government, which would be the Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's departments. The officers of those departments are educated in their duties all the time during their service in the line; but the great supply departments of the Government, or the technical departments of the Government, must have more than a temporary detail to render an officer efficient. Take for instance our Engineer Corps. The officers of that corps are engaged in special work; and while the matter was left out of the recommendations of the Secretary of War, the hearings before the Military Committee in the past showed that this corps was placed on all fours with the Ordnance Bureau, and was only left out of the recommendations of the present Secretary of War because of the fear that it would endanger the passage of the measure.

There has been criticism of our staff, and there always will be criticism of the staff and the organization of an army in this country when the time comes that we must multiply the military force of the United States ten or more times in less than three weeks.

Mr. COX. In this connection I would like to ask the gentleman a question in order that we may get at the points of this bill.

Mr. HULL. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. COX. By the exercise of the President's power under this bill, what will be the number of your standing army?

Mr. HULL. If the President sees fit it will be ninety-six thousand and a few hundred men.

Mr. COX. Then the President can enlist a standing army of 96,000 men. Is that right?

Mr. HULL. The bill specifically authorizes him to do so.

Mr. COX. Now, suppose the President does not exercise that power, what will be the number of our standing army?

Mr. HULL. Fifty-eight thousand, in five years from now. It will be less than 50,000 now.

Mr. COX. So the President can increase the Army to 96,000 men upon his own volition: is that true?

Mr. HULL. The bill specifically provides that the President, in



the present exigency, shall have the right to recruit the Army to a maximum of 96,000 and a few hundred men.

Mr. COX. I hope my colleague on the committee will yield a moment or two further. We want to get a few facts in this matter. It appears then that you are proposing to confer upon the President the power to increase the Army to 96,000 men?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir; and two years ago the Senate—

Mr. COX. I do not care what the Senate did.

Mr. HULL. Two years ago the Senate proposed to confer upon the President the right to expand the Regular Army from 27,000 to 65,000, and also proposed to give him the right to organize 35,000 men into 30 provisional regiments, to be used in his discretion. That was done by the Senate and concurred in by the House—a much larger discretion than conferred by this bill.

Mr. COX. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, let me ask one more question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HULL. I am anxious to yield to the gentleman all I can; but this debate is limited to two hours, and there are others who want to talk.

Mr. COX. I am not going to indulge in any debate. I am going to let the gentleman make the debate.

Mr. HULL. The five-minute rule will let all these gentlemen in. I will yield once more, and then I hope I shall not be further interrupted.

Mr. COX. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman. As I understand, this bill confers upon the President the power to increase the standing army to 96,000 men.

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes.

Mr. COX. Now, let us settle that.

Mr. HULL. That is settled. And that being settled, I hope my colleague will let me go on.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman objects, I will not say another word; but I may say something before we get through with this bill.

Mr. HULL. I hope so. I shall be delighted to hear from my friend from Tennessee, as I always am; but at present there is only a short time at my disposal. I think there is no difference between the gentleman and myself, or between any members of the House, as to what the bill does in that respect.

I was discussing the staff, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Tennessee interposed his inquiry, and I desire to say that the committee was divided in opinion as to the matters suggested by the Secretary of War, whether they would accept the entire recommendation made by that official or not. But a large majority of the committee determined that in certain departments of the staff of the Army details might be made in the lower rank, and that when a man had reached the position of a major on the staff, then that he should be fixed in that rank. In the more technical corps of the Army no detail system was thought advisable.

The provision of the bill also proceeds to modify existing conditions to the extent that no man can be detailed who has not passed an examination, and no man can come up and take this examination—that is, no officer of the line—until he has been so recommended by his commanding officer. The committee, of course, recognize the need of the most careful selection of staff officers, and have provided for details in the lower grades in the Quartermaster's, Subsistence, Judge-Advocate's, and Pay Departments and Signal Corps.

We believe that we have so guarded these and also provided for final promotions as to give the most efficient officers the rewards to which they are entitled and give the Army an efficient staff for time of war, so far as the numbers authorized will permit. This allows each officer who is recommended for detail upon this service to stand absolutely upon his own merits. In this regard it provides for efficiency just as is provided in the other departments of the Army. It applies to the Quartermaster's, Commissary's, and Judge-Advocate's Departments and the Pay and Signal Corps, but does not apply to what may be called the more technical corps, like the Engineers, the Ordnance, and the Medical Corps. Now, by the operation of this law a man must give some indication of his aptitude for the position before he is fixed on the staff in the corps where details are allowed and as now provided by law in the three, and I think that the result, and that is the opinion of the committee, is to give the very best service to the country when the service of the Army is needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word as to the criticisms that have been made on the line and the staff. Since 1838 the staff has existed substantially as it is now established. Previous to that we had the detail system throughout the staff.

The Seminole war, which has been frequently referred to during the previous investigations on the subject, demonstrated the utter inability of the staff, as then organized, to grasp existing conditions, and Congress changed to present organization. Since then, however, since the adoption of the change to which I was referring, we have educated men in all the lines of duty connected with the Army, so that the entire world recognizes the fact that never was

an army so well cared for, fed, or clad, or provided with all that was necessary to make it effective, as the Army of the United States since the beginning of the late war with Spain; and the same can be said as to the civil war. The 2,000,000 men then in the service were thoroughly cared for in all respects by the present staff organization, and no general of experience then has ever advocated a radical change.

Our Quartermaster's Department in the late war not only met all of the conditions which were forced upon it in such an emergency, but at the same time has organized a transport service, entirely new to our country, that stands to-day without a rival in the armies or navies of the world. Our Ordnance Department is recognized as being managed by men of the highest technical skill, men who administer upon property of the United States year after year involving more than \$40,000,000 and in capacity stand, I may say, without a rival amongst the nations of the world. The Corps of Engineers have shown the highest skill and are entitled to the confidence and admiration of our people; and when you come to the Signal Corps, crippled as it has been, organized upon a system of detail, which was after years of trial abandoned, you will find a corps of regulars and volunteers working in harmony, whose skill in technical electric work compares more than favorably with that of any army in the world.

The head of it was a signal officer of the Regular Army. We all recognize the fact that through the excellent system organized by him the first line connecting the world and making communication between the world and the old city of Peking possible was due to the enterprise, skill, and work of our Signal Corps, and it has been recognized throughout this war that it has kept pace with the movements of the troops and with the requirements of the service under all circumstances and in all places where war was progressing, so that the people of the United States have been informed day by day what has been going on in different parts of the world where its Army is stationed. This chief believes in selection and a permanent corps, and opposes the detail system.

And, Mr. Chairman, we believe the system which carried the country through the great wars of recent years should not be abandoned, but that we should broaden it at the bottom, improve it if it is possible to improve it, and make such changes as have been demonstrated to be necessary; and that we shall avail ourselves of all the information and of all of the facts which a trial of the system in actual service has demonstrated to be necessary and desirable. The committee, I think, have no difference of opinion on that point now. No one from civil life can be appointed to the lower ranks of the staff corps after these vacancies have been filled. The committee have struck out the age limit in all these corps, with the proviso that men who are now serving in the volunteers, holding commissions in the Volunteer Army, shall be eligible to these appointments, regardless of their age; after original vacancies are filled and all places are filled from the line of the Army, no age limit is necessary.

Mr. MARSH. You mean now serving.

Mr. HULL. Now serving or who have been commissioned since the 21st day of April, 1898. This opens the Pay Department, the Judge-Advocate's Department, the Quartermaster's Department, and the Commissary Department to those who have served the country during this war, without regard to age. They are left with the record they have made, and that matter is left with the President of the United States, with the exception of a provision of two lines that I do not regard as of importance enough to keep in the bill if any member of this committee objects to it. That provision is—

Who shall establish their mental and moral fitness to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War.

I see nothing in that one way or the other. It has been objected to by some, but, so far as I am concerned, I regard it as of no consequence, because these men have their records made of actual service. They are to be appointed by the President. They must be confirmed by the Senate; and if they run that gauntlet, I have no fear as to their mental and moral qualifications.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to section 19, with regard to the establishment of a nurse corps, and to ask him if that section does not in substance embody the bill that was defeated by a very overwhelming vote in the House at the last session of Congress?

Mr. HULL. No.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. What is the difference?

Mr. HULL. That bill provided for a separate corps of nurses and a more elaborate programme. This is sent by the War Department, and is simply what they have adopted and what is now in force in the Department.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It is not the old bill?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; not at all. It is recommended by the Surgeon-General, and the only reason that we put it in this bill is this: There is an old law, I think nearly fifty years old, which provides that nurses in the Army shall have 20 cents a day. This regulation of the War Department now gives these nurses exactly



what this bill provides. The Comptroller of the Treasury has notified the War Department that unless this Congress fixes the pay of these nurses he is going to reduce them to 20 cents a day, and everybody knows you can not get nurses at any such figure.

It is an anomaly to put a nurse corps in an Army organization bill, but this provision was sent by the War Department. The Surgeon-General and the Secretary of War believe that this provision ought to be passed with this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one word. An attempt has been made during the last campaign to make it appear that the Republican party, as a whole, were in favor of a great standing army and that they would not depend upon the volunteers in the future. I want to say to this committee and the country that there is no man on this side of the House who believes in a great standing army; but I hope there is no man on this side of the House who does not believe that we should have an army large enough for the needs of the country from year to year, in time of peace as well as in time of war; in time of peace, because the volunteer soldier will not enlist and remain in the service to perform the duties performed by the Regular Army.

The volunteer is a man who leaves his home and business, under the temporary necessities of the Government, from a high sense of patriotism to fight its battles. The volunteer has been the great fighting arm of this Government in all of its past, and the volunteer will remain the great fighting arm of this Government in all of its future. There is no question about that. But the volunteers will not remain in the service in times like these, because they do not desire to make the Army their permanent business. We need a regular army large enough to take the first fighting line until our volunteers can be organized in every great war. This bill gives that in a small measure, and in a small measure only. It does not create an army that can be for one moment compared with any army of Europe.

My good friends of the opposition went through all of our districts in the North in the last campaign saying that we were adopting the German system, and almost every opposition paper had a picture of every citizen carrying a soldier. A discussion of the bills which had been before Congress convinced the people of the falsity of such charges, and the result of the discussion can be read in the election returns from almost every district in the North.

Germany, with only a little more than two-thirds—hardly two-thirds—of our population, has an army of over 600,000 men all the time. It has an army of more than 3,000,000 of trained soldiers, with their organization in every neighborhood, with their arms and accouterments ready to put on in twenty-four hours, has these trained soldiers all the time. We have nothing of the kind and ask nothing of the kind. A man who would deal fairly with this question as a patriotic American citizen will concede the fact that this Army is the very lowest number that this great nation should provide. I know that it will be said, in criticism of this measure, that we have too many officers.

Gentlemen, this nation has never had a trained corps of officers sufficient to meet its demands. In this last war there was a scarcity of officers; there were cases where there was only one man commissioned commanding companies. We depleted the Regular Army to provide for the volunteers, and it has continued to be depleted since the beginning of the war. To-day in the Philippines and in Cuba and Porto Rico and in the United States a large number of companies have with them but one commissioned officer. This bill does increase the commissioned force, making it a permanent increase, which ought to be done.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will it interrupt my colleague to ask him a question right here at this point?

Mr. HULL. Not at all.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to know what provision, if any, has been made in this bill for retaining in the permanent service those volunteer officers who have distinguished themselves in the Spanish war or the Philippines, or what grades it will be possible for them to attain.

Mr. HULL. You mean in the line or staff?

Mr. HEPBURN. In the line and staff.

Mr. HULL. In most staff places held by regulars the same is open to volunteers on the staff without regard to age. In the line of the Army there is no age limit; but, Mr. Chairman, there is a limit as to where they go in. They go in as first or second lieutenants in the line and in the lower grades of the staff.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a further question? Under the provisions of this bill, for instance, take the case of Brigadier-General Funston, now in the Philippines, or Lieutenant-Colonel Miller, of the Fifty-first Iowa, officers who have distinguished themselves—is there a possibility under the terms of this bill of either of those distinguished officers attaining any grade above that of first lieutenantancy?

Mr. HULL. No; there is not, unless they shall be appointed brigadier-generals.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him still another question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would you object, at the proper place, to the insertion of an amendment of this character—I do not know just where it should come in:

*Provided, That any and all officers below the grade of colonel authorized by this act may be filled by appointment from the list of volunteer officers, either of the line or staff, that have been commissioned since the 1st day of April, 1898, it being the intent and meaning of this act to place the volunteer officers commissioned since April, 1898, upon a complete equality with any and all other persons as to their eligibility for appointments authorized by this act.*

Mr. HULL. Yes, I should object to that for this reason, that you would put men in that way over those who have served in the same war, and who have in addition to that served, some of them, twenty years and more, some of them thirty-five years, without having yet reached the grade of major, men who have served on the Indian frontier, risking their lives in all the battles that have pushed our civilization forward as the frontier has been pushed backward during the last thirty years, and make a man who has served but two years in the same battles these men served in their ranking officers. It would not be just.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would it be unjust to these gentlemen when you remember that you are increasing the number? You do not disturb the possibility of promotions as they now exist for these officers you have named, but you have increased the total number of officers. Would it be unjust if you increased the eligible list from which the officers should be drawn?

Mr. HULL. We have increased the number of officers in the Regular Army from civil life, during the last two years, to such an extent that the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa would displace all of them as well as the regulars. For instance, each regiment from my State had certified to the President one man for a commission in the Regular Army under the bill that we passed two years ago. That same thing applied to other States. I do not believe that it is fair to give a man who served two years a field officer's rank.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me? Have not all these officers been provided for upon the basis of an Army of 65,000 men? Now, with this addition of 35,000, you are increasing the number of officers?

Mr. HULL. Yes, but that is not the point with me.

Mr. HEPBURN. And you are leaving all the places for these officers in the Army of 65,000 as they are now substantially. They are not in any way affected as to the rapidity of their promotion beyond what they now have.

Mr. HULL. They are affected because there are more men in the lower grade. But not only that; I do not believe it is fair to say to the man who has served two years that he can rank a man that has served twenty-five years. I believe that it would destroy the efficiency of the Army. I believe that the officers who have served through all the lower grades so slowly ought not to be outranked. Some of them who served through the civil war are now only captains in the Regular Army and are only waiting to get one more promotion before retiring. It would be an injustice to give a man who participated in the same battle, because he happens to hold a higher temporary rank than the other, a place in the permanent establishment way above those who have fought for years to attain their rank. But this can come up under the five-minute rule, and I wish the gentleman would take it up at that time.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit me, I would like to ask a question.

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Section 36 provides as follows: That any officer of the Army on the active list below the grade of brigadier-general who served during the civil war shall, when retired, be retired with the rank and pay of the next higher grade, except such officers as may be retired under section 34 of this act.

Now, that is a similar provision to the one in the naval personnel bill, and I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that that provision aroused very great feeling and resulted in a bill in the Senate to make it retroactive.

Mr. HULL. The committee considered that and refused to take up the question of a retired list. As far as I am concerned, I do not think there would be any injustice in doing it, but this bill confines it to grades below that of brigadier-general, taking in the grade of colonel. In my judgment this section does as small an amount of justice to the old soldiers of the civil war as it is possible, if we do anything for them.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It is justice with discrimination. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes. But if we can not do full justice let us do what we can. Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HEPBURN. Before the gentleman from Iowa takes his seat I would like to ask a question.

Mr. HULL. Very well.

Mr. HEPBURN. Can you give the grade of that officer who in 1866 was in the civil war and who occupies the lowest grade now? Are there any of them who are not field officers?



Mr. HULL. I was told at the Department yesterday that there were one or two who are yet captains. I can tell by looking over the Army Register, but that is something of a job.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is in the artillery?

Mr. HULL. I did not ask what branch of the service.

Mr. MARSH. It is in the cavalry—Captain Chase.

Mr. HULL. I can give the names of a great many who are majors.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to ask the chairman a question.

Mr. HULL. Very well.

Mr. GAINES. At the bottom of page 22 of the bill, section 19 provides, among other things, as follows:

That the nurse corps (female) shall consist of one superintendent, to be appointed by the Secretary of War, and whose term of office may be terminated at his discretion, whose compensation shall be \$1,800 per annum, and of as many chief nurses, nurses, and reserve nurses as may be needed. Reserve nurses may be assigned to active duty when the emergency of the service demands, but shall receive no compensation except when on such duty: *Provided*, That all nurses in the nurse corps shall be appointed or removed by the Surgeon-General, with the approval of the Secretary of War; that they shall be graduates of hospital training schools, and shall have passed a satisfactory professional, moral, mental, and physical examination.

Now, suppose the nurse is already in the employ of the Government, say in the Philippine Islands, what provision is made for taking care of that efficient nurse who has passed the examination and is not a graduate of one of these schools?

Mr. HULL. There is no provision on that subject other than that in the bill. The bill conforms to what the War Department is now doing.

Mr. GAINES. Will you turn out all those nurses?

Mr. HULL. Those who are now in have come in under provisions similar to those in this bill.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to ask another question. It relates to the question of compensation. On page 23 the bill provides:

That the pay and allowances of nurses, and of reserve nurses, when on active service, shall be \$40 per month when on duty in the United States and \$50 per month when without the limits of the United States.

Where does that apply? What do you mean by the term "United States" differently used here?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman can answer that question just as well as I can. That is the same old question that we have already gone over. I decline to yield further to these questions, because it is taking up time which should be devoted to general debate and is not for real information. When we come to discuss the bill under the five-minute rule I shall be glad to answer any question that any gentleman may desire to ask.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I would like to ask a question in relation to section 40. Does my friend understand that that section abolishes the canteen? Will that be the effect?

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will read the section, and then read the provision of the existing law, he can answer that question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am assured that it does not abolish the canteen, but I would like to have an assurance from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HULL. Well, I do not want to give any assurance on that subject. The language is something which the gentleman can construe for himself.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I ask this question because there was a good deal of discussion as to the intent of the legislation enacted in the last Congress on this subject.

Mr. SULZER. That is a very tender subject. The gentleman ought not to press his question upon the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman from Iowa is familiar with this bill, and I am not. I would like him to indicate at what point the matter, which I read some time ago, will properly come in.

Mr. HULL. I do not remember the section exactly, but I will inform my colleague when I look it up.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HULL. The only objection I have to yielding is that this is not really general debate, but matter which should come in under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CORLISS. I wish only to ask this question: What effect will the provisions of this bill have upon volunteer officers holding the position, say, of captain in the Commissary or Quartermaster's Department?

Mr. HULL. It leaves such officers eligible to appointment.

Mr. CORLISS. To what position?

Mr. HULL. To the position of captain in the Commissary or Quartermaster's Department, without regard to age.

Mr. CORLISS. So that a captain in the Volunteer Commissary Department in the Spanish War may be continued by the President permanently in the Army without regard to age?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir. We give that concession to the volunteers.

Mr. MARSH. The chairman ought to state, perhaps, that there

is a limit to that process. The limit is when vacancies are filled that are provided for in this bill.

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. MARSH. When they are once filled, that ends the promotions from the volunteer force?

Mr. HULL. Yes; I supposed the gentleman from Michigan understood that.

Mr. CORLISS. Take, for instance, a captain in the Commissary Department now serving in the Philippine Islands. As I understand, he will serve until July 1, 1901. Without action on the part of the President would he, under this bill, be retired from the service?

Mr. HULL. Without action on the part of the President recommending him he would be. But the President has authority to commission him in the regular service as a member of the permanent staff corps if he desires to retain him in the service.

Mr. CORLISS. But is he not given a preference over one who has not served in that capacity?

Mr. HULL. He is given an absolute preference, by being the only man not in the Regular Army who can be appointed; and the bill gives him a positive preference, which, in my judgment, is almost a direction, that when these vacancies occur, if there are suitable men in the volunteer service they shall be appointed to these places. The provision of the bill is an expression of opinion by Congress as to that matter, and that is just as far as we can go, because the President has the right of appointment. We can not take it from him, and should not if we could. I now reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SULZER obtained the floor.

Mr. SULZER. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

[Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, it will be impossible in the short time allotted to me to go over a vast field and discuss the questions presented upon an issue of this kind, and I shall have to content myself mainly with a general protest against the passage of this measure.

I would, however, call attention to the House of the undue haste with which this measure is being foisted upon the consideration of this House.

I can not see the necessity of the haste. Five or six months yet remain before the temporary force now in the field will have to be discharged because the time of their service will expire. Is it because, Mr. Chairman, that a decision of another branch of this Government is anticipated which would possibly make it unnecessary that there should be a large permanent or temporary military establishment created?

In a short time, we are informed by the public press, this great question, this question involving the validity of constitutional government in our foreign possession, will be decided, and it is known to the public mind everywhere that the highest court must soon pass upon this question, and may probably decide against the constitutionality not only of the Porto Rican bill, but of the anticipated similar legislation with reference to the Philippines. Then, I presume, it will be unnecessary to have any army for the Philippines, and the Republican Administration will make post haste to withdraw its jurisdiction and control from the Philippines. Can it be possible that the Republican party anticipates such a contingency and is therefore attempting to forestall such a decision and to provide for a large standing army at all events?

But, sir, I am opposed to any material increase of the Regular Army, either temporary or permanent, for purposes of conquest, because it strikes at the fundamental principles of our institutions. It is a departure from American traditions. It is in the face of constitutional government, and it is in the face of local self-government. Everyone knows, although not disclosed in this measure, that this army is intended for a military government over the Philippines; that it is intended to inaugurate a species of government in those distant islands which is foreign to every constitutional precedent in this country.

Military governors and commissioners, backed by the strong arm of the military, are to rule and are to be the future government of these people; and when that is done, as it is declared in this bill, although indirectly it will be done, I say it flies in the face not only of constitutional government, but of such government as is vouchsafed by our Declaration of Independence, which provides for a government by the consent of the governed.

We can not maintain a republic here and inaugurate a colonial government in the Philippines. We can not maintain here the principles that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that governments are instituted to secure these rights, and that all just powers of



government are derived from the consent of the governed, and at the same time force a government, however beneficent, upon the people in the Philippines against their consent, without doing violence to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Such a course must end sooner or later in absolutism and destroy our free institutions. This, if no other reason—and there are many others, such as the enormous expense which the great increase of a large standing army would entail, the injustice of a war of conquest, etc.—compels me to oppose this bill.

It is said by gentlemen that it will be policy to vote for some increase in the Regular Army, and that it is policy to bow to the inevitable; that the American people have spoken and by their voice have pronounced for an increased Regular Army and a colonial form of government.

Mr. Chairman, when the mad passions of the hour shall have subsided, when the people, before it may be too late, upon sober second thought, shall have restored this great Republic to its pristine strength and glory, or perhaps when it is too late and this Republic shall have crumbled into the dust—in either event, when the calm historian shall record this sad chapter in our country's history, let it be said that the Democratic party, through its chosen representatives, stood with unflinching courage by the Constitution, by the Declaration of Independence, by local self-government, by civil liberty, and, like the faithful mother, amid the deadly blasts of the storm, drew its children closer in its loving embrace, ready to perish with them rather than to desert them in the hour of their peril. [Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I can not bring myself to vote for this bill, for there is a great deal of good in it. The sections that refer to reorganization contain many excellent provisions, and did the bill have no other object in view but the reorganization of the Army I should vote for it. The reorganization features are by no means perfect, but if enacted they would work great improvement in the efficiency of the service.

I concede that we need a large increase in the artillery, as we are far short of the number required to man our seacoast guns now in position. I also concede that for tactical purposes we need an increase in our field army.

While opposed heart and soul to militarism, I am not one of those who has fixed upon an arbitrary number for the size of the Army and has declared that one private more than that number means militarism and oppression, while one private less means liberty. I have always maintained, since I have been a member of this House, that the standing Army in time of peace should be large enough, and no larger, to be expanded in time of war so as to constitute a first line of defense behind which volunteer regiments may be raised. For this purpose, and for this purpose only, I am willing, and always have been, to vote for a reasonable increase of the standing Army in time of peace. I do not think, however, that in time of peace, for tactical or for any other reasons, the Army need be 100,000 strong.

This bill fixes a minimum skeleton Army. While I think that that minimum is possibly larger than tactical considerations require in time of peace, it is merely a difference of opinion; and did the bill stop there I might be willing to waive my opinion in deference to that of the Committee on Military Affairs. But the bill goes further than this in an entirely new and unthought-of direction.

It authorizes the President, whenever he may see fit, to increase the Army to 100,000 men. It is conceded that if this bill becomes a law, because of present conditions in the Philippines the President will forthwith increase the Army to its maximum.

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution empowers Congress "to raise and support armies." There is no constitutional authority in the President to raise armies; it is a power distinctly limited by the Constitution to Congress; it is a trust power that we as trustees can not delegate to another. It has been said upon the floor that this power can never be exercised by the President without an appropriation to support the increased establishment; but the moment the President increases the establishment under this bill a charge has been created upon the Treasury, and if Congress fails to appropriate, then every enlisted man provided in this bill and not appropriated for can go to the Court of Claims and recover his pay. I have the greatest personal respect for the present incumbent of the White House, but I do not believe that any man, be he never so wise and never so good, should be intrusted, or can be intrusted under our Constitution, with the vast power that this bill proposes to confer upon the Chief Executive. It would make him the most independent and supreme war lord on earth, with the exception of the Czar of Russia and the Sultan of Turkey.

It is said that the conditions that require an army of 100,000 men are only temporary in their character. If this be true, why not provide temporarily to meet them? If present conditions in the Philippines are, in the opinion of the majority, permanent,

why not say so and prepare to meet them? In the face of an emergency it is proposed to entirely reorganize our Army on a permanent basis for all time to come, and with the reorganization to incorporate provisions to meet an emergency that ought only to occur in war. In time of war I believe that powers ought and can be constitutionally conferred upon the President, as commander in chief, that can not be so conferred in time of peace. If the bill had limited the President's power to increase the Army to time of war, then my position would have been different, for under our Constitution Congress would first be obliged to act in declaring war before the President would have the right to raise the Army to its maximum.

I recognize the existence of the emergency with which we are confronted in the Philippines. I am unwilling to deprive the President of a single man deemed by him to be necessary at the present time; but I am equally unwilling, in the face of emergency, to yield powers to the President which I feel we have no constitutional right to give him. I shall, therefore, at the proper time, move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, with instructions to report back forthwith a substitute continuing the present Army law for a further period of two years, or until the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

If my substitute is agreed to, it will give the President all the men he wants to meet the emergency, and then, during the next session, with ample time at our disposal, we will be able to enact a law intelligently and scientifically reorganize the Army. If at the end of two years there is still need of an Army of 60,000 men in the Philippines, we can then determine if conditions now called temporary have become permanent; and if so, we can legislate to meet them.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman who has just taken his seat whether he, in common with the gentleman who addressed the committee before him, thinks that this provision giving the President the power to increase or diminish the Army in a time of emergency is unprecedented?

Mr. McCLELLAN. What does the gentleman mean by the term "emergency?" There can only be one emergency, the time of war.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I mean danger of war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not without Congressional action—certainly not.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I desire to call the attention of gentlemen on the other side to several acts of the Congress of the United States with respect to that matter. Practically everyone knows that the time to increase an army is not after you have war, but before. In peace prepare for war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But that would necessitate the maintenance of an army of war strength, which even this bill does not contemplate.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. It necessitates only what ought, perhaps, to have been definitely expressed in this bill—the giving of power to the Executive of the United States, in case the situation proves dangerous, to increase the active force of the Army, at his discretion, within certain bounds.

Now, this is not unprecedented. On the contrary, acts which give that power are many, and they begin with the fathers of our country. In the year 1798 there was difficulty, but not war, with France. By an act of May 28 of that year the President of the United States was authorized—

Mr. COX. Will my colleague on the committee allow me one question?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will be glad if the gentleman will wait until I have finished the statement of these statutes.

The President of the United States was authorized, "in the event of a declaration of war against the United States, or of actual invasion of their territory by a foreign power, or of imminent danger of such invasion, discovered, in his opinion, to exist, before the next session of Congress, to cause to be enlisted and called into service a number of troops not exceeding 10,000," etc.

On July 16 of that year—remember, there was no war then—the President was given a general authority—a discretionary authority—"to raise, in addition to the present military establishment, 12 regiments of infantry and 6 troops of light dragoons, to be enlisted for and during the continuance of the existing differences between the United States and the French Republic, unless sooner discharged."

In March, 1799, it was declared lawful for the President of the United States, among other things, "in case imminent danger of the invasion of their territory by any power shall, in his opinion, be discovered to exist," to organize 24 regiments of infantry, besides riflemen, artillerymen, and cavalry.

And he was allowed, when it appeared expedient, during the session of the Senate or in their recess, to appoint their officers.

Again, in the year 1800—May 14—when we were not at war, the



President was authorized to suspend further military appointments.

Again, March 16, 1802, he was authorized, when he should deem it expedient, to organize a corps of engineers.

Again, in 1803—March 3—he was authorized, whenever he should judge it expedient, to require the executives of such of the States as he might deem expedient, and from their local situation most convenient, to take effectual measures to organize, arm, and equip, according to law, and hold in readiness to march at a moment's warning, a detachment of militia not exceeding 80,000, officers included.

Again, January 2, 1812, he was authorized, when he should have satisfactory evidence of actual or threatened invasion of any State by any Indian tribe or tribes, to raise, either by the acceptance of volunteers or by enlistment for one year, as many companies as he might deem necessary, not exceeding 6, as rangers.

Again, January 29, 1813, it was provided by Congress that there be raised such number of regiments of infantry, not exceeding 20, as, in the opinion of the President, may be necessary for the public service, to be enlisted for one year, unless sooner discharged.

Again, in 1832—June 15—the President was authorized to raise, by the acceptance of volunteers or by enlistments for one year, 600 mounted rangers, as the nature of the service may, in his opinion, make necessary.

Again, May 23, 1836, he was authorized to accept volunteers, either infantry or cavalry, not exceeding 10,000 men, to serve six or twelve months after they arrived at the rendezvous.

Gentlemen may say that these provisions merely give authority to enlist volunteers, and that the enlistment of volunteers is in accordance with precedent. But that is not all. In the year 1846—May 13—it was enacted—

That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized by voluntary enlistment to increase the number of privates in each and any of the companies of the existing regiments of dragoons, artillery, and infantry, to any number not exceeding 100, whenever in his opinion the exigencies of the public service may require the same; and to reduce the same to 64 when the exigencies requiring the present increase shall cease: *Provided*, That said enlistment shall be for the term of five years and no longer, unless sooner disbanded by the President.

A subsequent act, June 18, 1846, extends that power of enlarging or diminishing the companies to the volunteers already in service. Why, my friends, why? This is exactly the principle adopted by the present bill.

Gentlemen say this is a time of peace; or they ask us whether it is not a time of peace. It would be a time of peace except for such speeches as we have heard all too recently, declaring the right of the Philippine insurgents to hold their islands, notwithstanding the treaty with Spain. Every word of that sort speeds a Mauser bullet on its way; every word of that sort prolongs the time when the maximum of the Army will have to be maintained, and puts off the time when, by the provisions of this bill, the President of the United States is authorized to decrease that Army. It creates more danger of foreign complications and more difficulty of internal management. It makes more necessary the provisions of this bill in order that the Executive, whom we trust, shall have full power to increase or diminish the Army as may be necessary to meet any emergency which might arise. And how is it to be done?

Mr. Chairman, two years ago we had a bill before the House, which was known as the Hull bill, for the increase of the Army. It was a bill that very slightly enlarged the number of regular officers to be provided for the companies serving in the Regular Army; it contained provisions for increase of each company, which gave a total of about 85,000 men, in the discretion of the President. But that bill was not enacted into law. Congress chose to do otherwise. It chose to enlist an independent volunteer force of 35,000 men. We had passed the Hull bill through this House, and were forced to accept another bill for a volunteer army, and as a consequence there is not a member of this House who does not know some officer coming home from the Philippines—

Mr. SULZER. I know a large number who will never come home.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey (continuing). And some who are not coming home, who do not intend to make an army life their profession, who do not have the benefit of the retirement provision under the general law, who have served their country faithfully but have not the benefit of belonging to the Regular Army because they are men who served in a temporary army organized for a temporary purpose, who have given up their business affairs, but who will have no claim upon the Government in any shape after their present service expires. There is not a member present who does not know officers who are coming home in this condition and who will necessarily ask relief at their hands.

Now, with that condition of affairs before us, gentlemen propose to organize another volunteer army and repeat the mistakes which have already been made, and at the end of the two years' enlistment (or, as we hope, within less time) they will be coming

back, not as officers of the Regular Army, but simply as citizens, to find their employment gone. That is not our proposition, Mr. Chairman. That is not the condition of affairs which we seek to promote by the pending bill. Our proposition is that the Army of the United States shall be officered by men whose duty is there for life, and so organized as that it shall not be bound by hard and fast rule as to the number of men in each company, but capable of enlargement as occasion may require, so that if an emergency arises we should be in such condition as that the Executive of the Government might have the power to enlarge and diminish the Army from time to time as may be deemed expedient and necessary.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to meet such an emergency as that we do not propose to add another thirty-five regiments of infantry, but only five of infantry and five of cavalry. The artillery is recognized by all to be upon a peace basis and only for the protection of our coasts; and we only enlarge the present army to be sent to the Philippines by ten regiments instead of thirty-five. The bill gives places as a reward to the most deserving of all our Philippine volunteers, and does not attempt to enlist a new volunteer army, because it is not intended to enlarge the Army of the United States by thirty-five regiments of infantry and cavalry, but only by ten regiments altogether. That is the purpose of the bill, and that is the principle upon which it is based.

To continue your thirty-five regiments another two years would enable the officers to say that they had had four years' of active service, and the claim would then come from these same gentlemen on the other side of the House that these men have done such service that they will be entitled to have the Regular Army enlarged enough to make places for them all—that this is the pledge now made to them. That pledge has not been yet made. They were enlisted for two years only. Some of them have proved fit—fit to take rank with our Regular Army officers in the Regular Army; but (I say it with all deference) some of them have not had as much active service and have not shown their fitness so thoroughly, and some, perhaps, are not in good enough condition of health to remain in the Army.

The ten new regiments of infantry and cavalry will give room for the most deserving of these officers of volunteers to take their places in the Regular Army, whereby in the end they will receive the reward of a grateful country, in the ranks of retired Army officers, with retirement on three-quarters pay, when they are unable to continue longer in the service of the country.

The bill, therefore, enlarges the Army as a whole but little when at its minimum in time of peace; while, on the other hand, it gives to us in time of war, or when there is threatening of war, the right to increase these ranks from within, so that we can put forth as the first line against any attacking force, in case of sudden invasion, an army, not of 25,000 men, but of 100,000 men, under good officers, well armed, well equipped, and well organized, leaving time for the volunteers to come to the front afterwards.

Let no man tell me that these views are engendered by the difficulties in the Philippines. They were expressed in a bill which I introduced over four years ago, a bill to provide that regiments should be recruited locally, and that in time of war or expectation of war the members of every troop, battery, and company might be doubled in the discretion of the President. Those views were then supported by a report upon that line. They were supported on the floor at the introduction of the Hull bill. They are before this House. Experience has proved that this plan of organization, the one followed by the chief military nations of the world, giving the power to expand the line in time of war or threatened war by calling in new men to serve in old companies under tried officers, instead of by calling in new companies and new officers who know not their men—I say that this is the only plan upon which any nation can thoroughly rely in these days of great armaments, when attacks may come suddenly, and when we must provide in time of peace a system so elastic that it will respond immediately to the wants of the country in time of war.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] occupy some of his time now?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

[Mr. SHAFROTH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman on the other side use a part of his time?

Mr. HULL. I do not know that we have anybody else that wants to participate in the general debate. If the gentleman from New York has no one who wants to speak, why can not we proceed under the five-minute rule?

Mr. SULZER. We have several gentlemen on this side who want to use up our two hours.

Mr. HULL. The gentlemen on this side seem more anxious to get on with the bill than they are to talk.

Mr. SULZER. Then, if there is no one on that side who wishes



to speak, I will yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds I would like a statement as to the time which is left for each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has one hour and three minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] has one hour and twenty-two minutes.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to judge the pending bill by the newspaper reports, because it has been so recently reported to the House that there has been no opportunity to study its details; but as I understand them it fixes the minimum limit of the Regular Army at more than twice the number of men that it contained at the beginning of the Spanish war and gives to the President authority to increase the number by 66 per cent, or to make it nearly four times as large as it was at the outbreak of the war. Undoubtedly some increase is needed. Sufficient men should be provided to man our coast defenses. But taking into account every probable demand, it seems to me that a military establishment of 50,000 men should be ample for all needs of the country upon this hemisphere. This estimate is in harmony with the message of the President, which puts the number required for the Philippine Islands at from 45,000 to 60,000. There should undoubtedly be reform in the organization of the Army. We have had too many officers in proportion to the number of men, and the cost per soldier has thus been greatly increased. One objection to bill is that for a minimum army of 60,000 substantially the same number of commissioned officers are provided as would be needed for the maximum number of nearly 100,000. It is to be regretted that the bill does not give us the efficient and economical organization in the smaller army.

I am unable to accept the principle which would confer upon the Executive the discretion to multiply almost by two the regular standing Army of the United States; and I say this without regard to the present Executive, who would exercise the discretion, I believe, as patriotically and wisely as it could be exercised. The objection is one of fundamental principle. Congress should fix the number of men in our military establishment. The importance of an army in any government, and most of all in a republican government, is so great that it is a dangerous grant of power, and I believe one that can not be paralleled even in the constitutional monarchies, to bestow upon the Executive such authority in fixing the number of the Army. This extraordinary discretion is not conferred for an emergency or with any limitation as to time. The power is his, not for a day or a year, but it will require to terminate it a law which must pass both Houses of Congress and be approved by the President, or be passed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses over his veto.

It may be said that money must still be provided by Congress to maintain the Army. But after a charge upon the public Treasury has been created by law, an appropriation becomes merely a matter of form. In fact, a soldier for whose pay an appropriation should be denied might proceed in the Court of Claims and recover judgment against the Government. We propose by this bill, therefore, to confer upon the Executive the power to raise the Regular Army from about 60,000 men to about 100,000 men, and also the power of creating a charge upon the Treasury equal to the difference in the cost between those two armies. It strikes me that this is a violation of most essential principles. Congress should not confer such a responsibility upon the Executive; but, as the great political organ of the Government, and the direct representative of the people, it should always maintain control in a matter of such importance.

Furthermore, I do not believe that it is necessary that Congress should authorize a permanent military organization of 100,000 men. I believe that such an organization is vastly in excess of the permanent need of this country. I do not say that that number is too great if we are to decide to maintain perpetually an empire over those 1,300 islands in the tropics of Asia. I fear we shall need them all as long as we shall maintain our government there. I am firmly convinced that the honor and interests of the United States demand that we should make it the goal of American statesmanship to extricate ourselves from responsibility for the government of those islands and to return again to the historic policy discerned by the eagle eye of Washington more than a hundred years ago, and which was marked out by the location of this country, by the character of our Government, and by our obvious interests.

It seems to me the time has arrived at last when the question of the ultimate relations of this country to the Philippine Archipelago should be considered and our position as a nation declared. Before the treaty we were told that the question could not with propriety be discussed; that we were at war with Spain, and that a discussion of that character should wait the return of peace. After peace had been declared and we had bought from her the civil war which we had at least encouraged against her, we were told that it would not do to discuss the ultimate relations of the Philippine Islands with us while they were in what was called a

state of rebellion against their purchasers. We have been told, however, with a good deal of iteration by our generals and commissioners and other civil officers that the organized rebellion was broken up; that an appearance of war was only kept up by the hope of a political occurrence in this country which has not taken place.

If the question can not with propriety be discussed to-day, if we must wait until the Philippine Islands are as peaceful as Ohio or Massachusetts, I fear that it will never become proper for us to discuss what our duties and our interests demand, but we shall be thrust along to one ill-considered step after another until our position shall become irretrievably fixed. In my opinion our policy in the Philippines should have been declared at the outset and should have been a similar policy to that which we declared for Cuba. Unfortunately our course was consistent with no other theory than that the Filipino had been fighting simply for a change of masters and that the yoke of the United States might be substituted for the yoke of Spain. If we had practiced a similar policy in Cuba, which some influential gentlemen seem to regret, who can doubt that we should have had a war in Cuba as we have one in the Philippine Islands?

The Filipinos had an army more thoroughly organized than the army of Cuba. They had been treated more nearly as our allies, and had conducted themselves bravely and efficiently in battles in which our own soldiers were engaged. Would it not have been beyond the bounds of all belief that we should not have had war if, under these conditions, we purchased and endeavored to assert the title over them which we ourselves had encouraged them to resist? But whether or not there should have been a definite declaration of our policy two years ago, I believe that to-day, when we are proposing a military establishment to deal with that problem, it becomes of the greatest importance to consider whether the problem itself is to be perpetual and what is the ultimate purpose of this nation with reference to those people.

If we shall decide that it is for our interests not to remain permanently in the Philippine Archipelago—if our statesmen shall apply their ingenuity, not to the discovery of difficulties in the way of our getting out, but to find some means by which we can honorably recur to our ancient policy—a solution of the problem will more certainly be found consistent with that view. If, on the other hand, it shall be found for the interest or the honor of this country to embark permanently upon a colonial policy in the tropics of the Orient, it will be a thousand times better to embark upon that policy understandingly and having beforehand carefully weighed its disadvantages.

I do not propose to discuss at any length the unfitness of our system of government for the colonial policy, because that proposition has been so often and so thoroughly discussed. There is undoubtedly an irrepressible conflict between the principle of that policy and the great lesson of our history. I believe that nothing is more strongly established by experience than the general wisdom of the principle as applied to communities that governments "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." The power of the strong state to make laws for the weaker state without its consent, to impose taxes according to its own will, disguised, as such a power has always been, under the sounding terms of freedom and civilization, has usually been productive of a national slavery as bad in principle and practice as individual slavery.

There is no community of interest between the people of the Philippine Islands and the people of the United States. We and they are geographically and ethnologically almost as far apart as the poles asunder. No advocate of retaining them (however he may have asserted as a reason for taking them that we had annexed contiguous territory, destined to become a corporate part of the United States) has been daring enough to maintain that we should make them a part of our political system. In fact, the argument against treating the inhabitants of an island which is geographically part of this hemisphere and may well some day enter into our political system as entirely outside the Constitution, without any of the fundamental human rights safeguarded there and subject absolutely to such laws as Congress might see fit to impose, was that if the people of Porto Rico were put upon a different basis, we should therefore be compelled to extend the same rights to the people of the Philippine Islands. The able lawyers and orators who defended the principle of the tariff upon Porto Rico were unable to discover a stronger argument for their position than that if we did not have the power to impose it, we could not retain the Philippine Islands. From the notion that the people of those islands should have constitutional rights they recoiled with a species of horror. I am making no extravagant assertion, therefore, when I say that no responsible public man in this country dreams of having the Philippine Islands become a part of the United States, as Louisiana and Florida became a part of the United States, and having them participate jointly with us in making laws for a common country.

Since, then, they are to have no share in our country's government—since we do not propose to "benevolently assimilate" them



to the point where they shall become an integral part of ourselves—upon what theory are we to remain there, and for what purpose? I believe that the underlying motive, and in fact the motive that has been most widely proclaimed upon the stump and in the debates in Congress, is that it is broadly for the advantage of the people of the United States, and especially for their pecuniary advantage, to remain there. I propose, therefore, to present briefly some of the reasons which lead me to believe that it is not for the interest of the United States permanently to occupy those islands. This is a view of the question which has not usually been discussed; and I discuss it to-day not because I think it of more importance than that of equal importance with the great question of principle, but because I consider it material to meet as fairly as I can the underlying argument which is presented in support of the policy. I do not claim novelty for my argument. It will only be upon a different line from that which is commonly pursued.

As a portion of the cost of retaining the Philippine Islands we are to include the maintenance of the greater part of the army established by this very bill. This measure is the firstborn and legitimate offspring of that policy. The cost of our Army is, on the average, about \$1,000 per man. With 27,000 men our war bill has been about \$27,000,000. With 100,000 men it has been about \$100,000,000. Those who are comparing our standing army with the armies of other nations are usually careful not also to compare the relative cost. On the basis of 100,000 men you will find that the direct cost of our Army is nearly equal to that of the great and overburdened military nations of Europe. The French army cost in the year 1899 \$125,000,000; the German army in the year ending March 31, 1900, \$130,000,000; the British army cost in the year 1900 \$100,000,000, and the Russian army in the year 1898 \$153,000,000. I understand these figures include the cost of pensions and fortifications. On the basis of this bill the estimate of the War Department calls for \$113,000,000, putting us fourth on the list of the five great powers I have named. But these figures by no means tell the whole story. There is another expense, not included in a direct military appropriation, which is a necessary incident to our Army and as much a part of its cost as the pay of a soldier. That is seen in our pension system. The American people have generously declared the policy of liberal pensions for their soldiers. The poorhouse is no place for the deserving soldier who has fought for his country. We are appropriating for pensions at the rate of \$145,000,000 a year. We have, then, from these two sources—from the direct war bill and from the pension appropriations—a total of about \$260,000,000 a year, which is vastly greater than the similar charges of any other nation, and greater even than the combined military expenses of France and Germany, those two great enemies who are armed to the teeth against each other. It has been supposed that we enjoyed an immunity from the warlike burdens which curse Europe; but the point is already reached where we have far outstripped any other nation in the element of military cost, and where, at the speed with which we are forging ahead, it is not unreasonable to expect that our annual outlay will equal that of three of the four greatest powers of Europe combined.

The pension charge of the system which we are now embarking upon is liable to be a heavy one. The American soldier born and brought up in a temperate climate is most certain to develop some weakness in his system by any protracted service in the Philippine Islands, or in any other tropical country. There are already nearly 40,000 applications for pensions growing out of the Spanish war, a greater number than that of the soldiers who actually participated in it. A pension roll has some of the elements of immortality. We still have a pension list growing out of the war of the Revolution which ended nearly a century and a quarter ago, and the policy of maintaining an army of 60,000 American boys in the Philippine Islands, that will be constantly decimated by disease and have to be fed with fresh supplies, will entail upon us and upon our posterity an enormous burden.

Let us look at the practical effect of this policy upon the actual expenditures of our Government. During the fiscal year which began more than twenty months after the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain our expenditures were \$120,000,000 greater than during our last peace year; and for the next year the estimates call for \$70,000,000 more than this enormous sum, which is an increase of \$190,000,000 over what the expenses were during the last year prior to the war. The effect of this policy is to bring with it a certain extravagance of expenditure in all the Departments of Government; and its cost is not measured simply by the money that is paid out for the greater Army and the greater Navy, although the extra charges for these two items undeniably account for the greater part of the increase. I have indicated to you, then, something of the actual cash cost of this policy; and it seems to me that a continuance of it is likely to increase rather than diminish that cost. But from a financial standpoint the expense is likely to be far greater than this. Great wars are most expensive things, simply from the money standpoint and disregarding the vastly greater expense incurred by the loss of human life. If a

country is liable to such a war, the insurance cost to meet the expense should be proportionately great.

Consider for a moment this element of expense to us. By our purchase of Louisiana we got rid of one powerful neighbor upon this continent. By the Spanish war we got rid of another neighbor that was once powerful. We have to-day only one great neighbor, and we are likely under present conditions to continue at peace with her, unless from the lack of something to take up their minds or to demonstrate that we are a great world power some of our enterprising statesmen may find it necessary to set us up in a war with Great Britain. We are therefore to-day in the possession of a continent with those inestimable possessions for a nation—two immense oceans for our boundaries. We have only one great neighbor, and with her we are not likely to go to war. But when we take the Philippine Islands, and force ourselves as a political power into the Orient, we do two things: We divide by two the ability of this country for offensive or defensive war, and we multiply at least by two our liability to war with some great power.

Under the condition of things that existed up to two years ago, we were practically invulnerable against attack except by a single nation. We had these two great scientific natural frontiers. With ordinary prudence we were beyond all question safe from attack, and it would be entirely for us to decide whether we should pursue any adversary where we could suffer material damage. But with 1,300 islands 10,000 miles from our capital city, and on the other side of the greatest ocean in the world, if any nation should see fit to take advantage of anything in our internal condition or our relations with other nations to deal us a blow, all that it would be necessary to do would be to seize some sand reef in the Asiatic tropics, run up its flag, and then the honor of this nation would demand that we should expend billions of dollars and the lives of tens of thousands of our boys in order again to get possession of that strip of sand.

We have thrown away our invulnerability, therefore, and have weakened our power in war for all its justifiable purposes by the adoption of this policy. And that we have increased the liability of war follows, necessarily, from the fact that we are thrusting ourselves among great and hostile neighbors and are taking a position which will invite an attack where war can be made upon equal terms, whereas under our old policy it was practically useless for other nations to attack us.

After you shall have fastened upon the country the policy furthered by this bill, it will be the merest theatric and spectacular display to declaim about economy. You may make some miserable savings by cheeseparing; you may check the construction of great public works demanded for our development at home in order to continue abroad a policy without profit and without glory. But if you continue this policy of Asiatic empire, you will lay broad and deep the foundations for a system of expenditure which will rest heavily upon future generations. This country was happily placed in a position making possible an exemption from foreign war. If we are deliberately and wantonly to throw away this advantage—if we are to adopt a policy which shall tax and burden two-thirds of our people in order that the other third may wear uniforms or be borne upon pension rolls, we shall be rejecting the most precious gift that Providence ever bestowed upon a nation.

Let us consider, then, possibilities of profit. We have seen prominent gentlemen upon the stump weave from their imaginations glittering fabrics of trade, and airily draw checks for \$100,000,000 of commerce each year with the Philippine Islands. Let us see if these drafts are liable to be paid when they are presented. When it was first proposed to set up an Asiatic empire the Treasury Department, with a commendable willingness to give members of Congress all possible light over this new pathway, presented to us the report of a commissioner who had investigated the question of trade. It appeared from that report that the yearly imports into the Philippine Islands amounted to less than \$20,000,000 on a silver basis, or about \$10,000,000 on a gold basis.

Assuming that we did not propose to adopt the Spanish system of colonial government, and that one of our methods of taking freedom to the people of those islands was not to compel them to buy American goods if they could purchase similar goods elsewhere at lower prices, we could not, of course, expect the whole of this trade. As a matter of fact, we have thus far secured only a small percentage of it. During the two years that we have been there that percentage has not materially increased. Most of the few things which these people want they apparently are able to purchase from other nations at cheaper prices; and so far as trade is not governed by price, but by sentiment, it is difficult to see how our trade prospects have been advanced by a policy which, according to the report of our commanding general, has produced for us a hatred that is widespread, and, I fear, will soon become ineradicable. Those islands, from their climate and situation, are never likely to become centers of trade; and the average inhabitant is not likely to be a better customer than the North American Indian. The latter at least requires, from his situation,



clothing to supply that warmth which the Filipino gets from his climate. Their own soil supplies them with food which is better adapted to them than our own products. The increase of our trade during the last two years is of slight importance in volume, and that increase has been mainly in those articles which it does no great credit to this nation to send there.

It must be remembered, too, in connection with the growth of trade, that we are maintaining 70,000 soldiers in the Philippines, or six times the total white population which was there at the time we occupied them, and who are consumers of our products. You may increase the foreign purchases of these people more than three times, and increase by as many times the percentage of the goods we sell them. These estimates are fanciful, and I believe improbable; yet, even upon that basis, and allowing 20 per cent of our sales as profits, you would not have \$5,000,000 per year. What is this paltry sum, which will go to a few individuals, compared to the enormous burden put upon the American people in order to secure it; and I have said nothing about the loss of thousands of American lives, for which there can be no recompense whatever in trade.

But in some mysterious way, by having the Philippines, we are to secure the trade of untold millions in the East. The Treasury Department, at the time it issued the report to which I have just referred, also put forth another document, holding before us the great aggregate of a billion dollars or more in trade with seven or eight hundred millions of people in the Orient. The bare scrutiny of the details of that trade, however, will disclose very little that we can gain. A great portion of it consists of the exports and imports of India and Australasia, colonies of Great Britain, many of whose products we shut out from our own markets because we can not compete with them in our own home. Does anyone imagine that the Philippine Islands can be a factor in securing us that trade? The great open field is China. The total imports into that country from the various nations appeared to be \$170,000,000, and one-half of this amount was in the products of India, that great contiguous country. Another large portion was from Hongkong, which, although it belongs to Great Britain, is a natural part of China. We will need something more than imposing columns of figures to demonstrate how even the possession of the Philippine Islands is to enable us to compete in China with the products of Hindostan or with the trade from Hongkong. The imports from the United States to China, as appears from the document to which I have referred, are about equal in value to the imports to that country from the whole continent of Europe. In the natural course of things you would naturally expect that the 250,000,000 or more people in Europe would sell China as much merchandise in value as the 70,000,000 in the United States.

The only chance for us to gain materially in China is from Great Britain, a country which was exceedingly anxious for us to enter into the competition, if it is considered that our going to the Philippines made us a competitor in any different sense from what we were before. If the exports to China from the United States and from Great Britain, not including Hindostan and Hongkong, were equally divided between the two countries our exports to that country would aggregate something over \$30,000,000. How many war ships or how many soldiers would the profit on that trade, which would go to a few individuals, pay the American people for maintaining it? And what reason is there why we should not have substantially all of it if we had nothing whatever to do with the Philippine Islands beyond at the most maintaining a naval station there? We can manufacture no more cheaply in the United States with the Philippines than without them. We shall have to go to China in competition with the other nations. The Philippines have had no immediate trade relations with China which by becoming their possessors we have secured the advantage of. You will find from the document to which I called your attention that the total trade between China and the Philippine Islands, going both ways, was an absolutely insignificant item.

There is no possible advantage that the possession of the Philippine Islands can give us in securing the trade with China, unless it should be that the other powers might shut us out from our natural rights of trade and that the possession of the Philippines would afford us a place from which we could send our ships of war to threaten the Chinese coast. That is the sum total of the possible advantage of the possession of the Philippine Islands in preserving the Chinese trade. A coaling station would, as I have said, give us the same advantage in this regard that we should derive from the whole group, although no nation has ever yet attempted to abridge our trade. Certainly our recent experience has not very forcibly demonstrated the value of the Philippines with reference to China from the war point of view. The attention of our 65,000 men seems to have been so thoroughly engrossed with the internal affairs of those islands that it was only after a considerable time and most painful efforts that a few thousand men were available for the movement in China. Assuming that we possessed the transport facilities, we could

have landed in China about the same time about the same number of men from San Francisco and taken them from our small ante-bellum Army.

But we are not treading upon new ground. The recent history of other nations is rich in the experience for which we are about to pay. The experience of England with the tropical colony of Jamaica is well known to all. Jamaica was a losing venture for England on any other basis than the contract-labor system, which meant practical slavery. Take the experience of Italy in Abyssinia. The financial statement of the minister of the treasury to the Chamber on May 5, 1896, showed that 160,000,000 lire had been actually appropriated for the African expedition, and that the expenditures for the fiscal year 1895-96 amounted to 124,733,000 lire, or nearly \$25,000,000. The war was abandoned because General Recotti, the minister of war, calculated that to succeed would require the employment of an army of 150,000 men for two years, at a cost of 1,000,000,000 lire. In about six months the Italians lost nearly 11,000 men, not counting prisoners; and this does not include the number who succumbed to the climate. The death rate among the troops from disease reached the enormous figure of 167 in 1,000. The total trade for that same year, in which \$25,000,000 were expended, amounted to 15,000,000 lire, or \$3,000,000, which is higher than the average annual trade. The average cost to Italy of maintaining her east African possessions for thirteen years was more than \$4,680,000 each year, or more than 50 per cent in excess of the total trade; and it is notorious that the official reports of the Italian Government do not show the full extent of the cost. The result was not merely most adverse to Italy, so far as the loss of men and the expenditure of money was concerned, but a revolution was produced in Italy and the throne itself was shaken.

The experience of France in Tonkin is directly in point. Tonkin, including Cochinchina, has about the area of the Philippine Islands. They do not approach by many hundred miles so near the equator as the Philippines. The population is almost exactly the same. From the enormous cost of the war in 1885 France has not yet fully recovered. Her men perished by thousands; she expended in less than a year 470,000,000 francs. The cost of Tonkin to France for the eleven years from 1883 to 1894 amounted to 534,000,000 francs, or a yearly average of 45,000,000. France, as is well known, pursues a most rigorous closed-door policy, making the most favorable possible conditions for the importation of her own products. The total trade between France and all her colonies with Tonkin amounted in the ten years 1883 to 1892 to \$12,642,000, a yearly average of \$1,264,000, as against a yearly average cost to her of \$3,908,000. Notwithstanding France's efforts, other nations have traded with Tonkin during that period to the amount of \$3,876,000 per year, or more than three times the trade of France. In other words, in ten years France spent 476,000,000 francs on Tonkin, in order to dispose of a total of 59,000,000 francs of products. I imagine that no one would contend that we should govern the Philippines more economically than France has governed Tonkin. We are a Republic more than in name, and republican governments are not cheap governments. The death rate of the French soldiers was enormous—almost equal to that of the Italian soldiers in eastern Africa.

The returns in the Statesman's Year-Book show a very similar condition in Madagascar, another French tropical colony. In the last two fiscal years for which reports are available the cost to France for running that colony has been about 15,800,000 francs for each year, or more than \$3,000,000. On the other hand, the total trade with France, including both imports and exports, amounted to about \$800,000 a year. Notwithstanding the discriminating French laws, the trade of Great Britain with this colony was more than double that of France. I believe that the Philippine Islands, from their location, from the character of their population, and from the wants of their people, would be less profitable in trade to us than Madagascar or Tonkin were to France, or Abyssinia to Italy. And what, during the last half century, has been the experience of Spain with tropical colonies? Surely no one will contend that we made her any the less strong by taking the Philippines from her.

The study of modern colonial history will dispel the illusion that colonies are usually a source of profit to the mother country. The chief exception is England. By reason of her contracted natural limits and her location the colonial policy was inevitable to England, and after she has with more or less success scoured the earth for two or three centuries in pursuit of her colonial policy very few things that are desirable in the way of colonies are left. England has shown judgment in the colonies which she has refused to keep as well as in those which she has taken. She once captured the Philippine Islands in war, and yet such was her idea of their value that she gave them up to Spain upon the payment of a small indemnity. The fact that they alone were substantially the only colonies which remained in the hands of Spain after three or four centuries of decay, except such colonies as she held in this hemisphere and which were practically saved to her



by the Monroe doctrine, is some evidence of the estimate put upon their value by the great powers. It is a doubtful question whether the trade of India compensates Great Britain for the enormous obligations that she is under. But no comparison can be made between India and the Philippines. The former had a great development of civilization more than two thousand years ago. Much wealth had been accumulated, and the consumption of her 300,000,000 people is infinitely greater than we could ever expect the consumption of the Philippine people to be. Great Britain has a colonial system which has been developing for hundreds of years. The cost to us of acquiring her efficiency and experience would be enormous; and as to the effect of colonies upon the trade of a nation, tell me, if you can, how it happens that while Great Britain is the greatest colonial power in the world the two countries that have been going by her with rapid strides in the matter of commerce are the United States, which until yesterday had no colonies, and Germany, whose scattered possessions are an admitted drain.

With reference, however, to the expansion of England, the expansion which has added to her strength and to her wealth has been mainly that which has occurred in vast and empty territories within the Temperate Zone. Those territories were fitted in character and climate to become the homes of Englishmen; and they have gone to them, bearing with them the institutions, laws, and habits of their native land, and have thus added strength to the mother country. India, for the reasons I have referred to, has probably been a source of profit to England; but when you take into account the serious problems which she has presented in England's foreign policy, and the wars to which her possession has given rise, she has come far short of being of unmixed advantage to England.

The Philippine Islands are lacking in the primary requisite of a colony, and that is the fitness to become the home of the people of the colonizing power. In the first place, those islands are not empty and unoccupied, but they are as densely populated as New England. The present population will have to be cleared off with the forests in order to make room for any great number of our own people. But, in the next place, the climatic conditions are such that they are not fitted to become the home of the Caucasian. The fact that after several centuries less than 20,000 whites are found living there, not counting the soldiers, is pretty strong proof that they are not fitted for the white man. The northernmost point of the islands is south of Calcutta, and from that point they extend for about 1,500 miles toward the equator.

It is urged that the possession of the Philippines will open new fields for the investment of capital, such fields being nearly exhausted at home. Possibly the limit is nearly reached for the exploitation of franchises in this country, but when vast tracts of land shall have been reclaimed, when the wooden stage of development shall have given place to stone and iron habitations built for 300,000,000 instead of 70,000,000 people, it will be time enough then to consider the exhaustion of our home field for investment.

The barest survey of the question convinces me that the cost to this nation in money of Philippine colonies will be greater than any pecuniary benefits it will receive; that while a few fortunes may be made by exploitation, a vastly greater burden will be imposed upon the nation as a whole than the benefits which any individuals may secure; that the islands are not likely ever to become a corporate part of this country; that they are not fitted to be the home of Americans; that they will greatly weaken the country in time of war and expose it to liability to war; that, worst of all, their retention will involve the destruction of tens of thousands of American lives, and that it will involve the departure from the traditional policy which has made this nation great.

The assertion of a policy of Asiatic domination will bring the Monroe doctrine tumbling about our ears, for we shall make ourselves the laughingstock of mankind if we say to the overcrowded nations of the other hemisphere, "Keep your hands off the empty and unoccupied portions of this continent," and then at the same time, having a sparse population, embrace a thousand islands in the other hemisphere. Such a course would deprive the Monroe doctrine of the last appearance of justice, and thenceforward it would have to stand upon force alone. In my opinion, in no proper sense of the word can this policy be called expansion. It is no more expansion or growth than is the cancer or the horrible tumor which swells the bulk of the human body, but saps it of its vitality and strength.

Then comes the accumulation of horrible race problems, of which we already have our full share in this country. Let me call to your attention the testimony of Lord Elgin, who was governor-general of India, and who could speak with the greatest authority upon this question. The quotations I make were cited in a pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth or Empire," written by one of the greatest scholars and writers in the British Empire, a man who has shown himself a sympathetic friend of American institutions—Prof. Goldwin Smith.

It is a terrible business, however, this living among inferior races. I have seldom, from man or woman, since I came to the East, heard a sentence which was reconcilable with the hypothesis that Christianity had ever come into the world. Detestation, contempt, ferocity, vengeance, whether Chinamen or Indians be the object. There are some three or four hundred servants in this house. When one first passes by their salaaming, one feels a little awkward. But the feeling soon wears off, and one moves among them with perfect indifference, treating them, not as dogs, because in that case one would whistle to them and put them, but as machines with which one can have no communion or sympathy. Of course, those who can speak the language are somewhat more in rapport with the natives, but very slightly so, I take it. When the passions of fear and hatred are ingrafted on this indifference, the result is frightful: an absolute callousness as to the sufferings of the objects of those passions, which must be witnessed to be understood and believed.

—tells me that yesterday, at dinner, the fact that government had removed some commissioners who, not content with hanging all the rebels they could lay their hands on, had been insulting them by destroying their caste, telling them that after death they should be cast to the dogs to be devoured, etc., was mentioned. A reverend gentleman could not understand the conduct of government; could not see that there was any impropriety in torturing men's souls; seemed to think a good deal might be said in favor of bodily torture as well! These are your teachers, O Israel! Imagine what the pupils become under such leading!

The newspapers of this country have frequently contained reports (whether true or false I do not know) of cruel treatment of the Filipinos by American soldiers and of Americans by Filipinos. But we can accurately predict what will take place if we permanently remain in that country. We shall have the race problem, and race hatred in general, in its bitterest forms.

But what shall we do with the Philippines? We are told that we have already taken them, we have already expanded. It is said, "You are arguing a question that is already closed." I insist, however, that we are not to submit to the perpetual drain which this policy will impose, because what was never an American problem has been treated as an American problem. Why should not the Philippine Islanders govern themselves? If they are not fitted to become the abode of Americans or a part of the American commonwealth, for what righteous purpose are Americans there? Let us treat the Philippine Islands according to American precedents. I would have no loosely defined protectorate. But it seems to me, from all the testimony, that if those people were permitted to govern themselves, after their own rude fashion, but still a fashion that fits them better than does our fashion, they could after a brief time walk alone as well as the people of many of the South American countries or the people of Haiti or of Cuba. I said let us treat them according to American precedents. What are those precedents?

How did we treat Mexico, that had only recently been a Spanish colony? After a checkered experience as a nation of hardly a generation, in which were seen disorder and governmental chaos, and all things that, it is predicted, will take place in the Philippine Islands, the people of the United States conquered that country and subjugated it as completely as a conquest can ever be effected by arms. Our flag was over the City of Mexico. A movement was made in this country, as general and widespread certainly as the movement for the annexation of the Philippines before the ratification of the treaty, in favor of our annexing the whole of Mexico. There was this to be said at least for that policy, that it was complicated with no delicate question of an alliance, that the territory was contiguous, and that it some time might become an integral part of the United States. Professor Bourne has reviewed, with a good deal of learning, a discussion of that subject. President Polk resisted the policy of wholesale annexation. Some of his advisors favored it, and among them James Buchanan; and the course of the latter curiously brings to view the cant with which it is invariably sought to conceal the felonious designs which a strong nation sometimes entertains toward a weak one. Buchanan desired to take the whole of Mexico. Polk resolutely opposed this policy, and in his message proposed to encourage the friends of peace in Mexico to establish "a republican government able and willing to make peace." Buchanan piously proposed to substitute for this the declaration that "we must fulfill that destiny which Providence may have in store for both countries." This submissive Christian spirit was not destined to have sway, and Mexico was not completely crushed under the heel of the victor and stripped of her last possession, even of her existence as a nation. We aided her in setting up a government that could meet some of the ends of government, although imperfectly. She was established under our protection. When our attention was engaged by civil war, a foreign power, ostensibly in the interest of liberty and civilization, took possession of Mexico. We had no sooner terminated our own struggle than we massed our troops along the Rio Grande and gave France notice that she must withdraw, and she withdrew. After years of struggle and revolution, Mexico has to-day a stable government, and I think no one would contend that it was not fortunate for her—fortunate, too, for the United States—that the extreme policy of extinction was not accomplished.

We have held up Haiti, although no other portion of the world has come so near not having a civil government as the Republic of Haiti. When such an enlightened governing agency as Great



Britain claimed a strip of Venezuela a few years ago we gave her notice to keep her hands off, to submit her claims to arbitration, although we were keeping out this high governing agency from a considerable portion of the country of South America and were maintaining a power which had government by revolution. There is at least one thing in government worse than government by revolution, and that is government by brute force. The government of one community by another community, of one race by another race, contrary to the customs and ideas of the governed, is something worse than government by revolution. I say, then, let us follow the American precedents, the policy that we have followed in the case of Haiti, Mexico, and Venezuela, and that we have proclaimed for Cuba. I say let us follow the dictates of justice; for this great nation, after favoring a people who were struggling for independence and encouraging them in that struggle, can never stand before the bar of history, having purchased that people, and having endeavored to crush those aspirations which not merely our own glorious example but our own direct incitement had aroused. The Filipino does not, perhaps, come up to Anglo-Saxon standards, and should not be judged by them. He may not make war according to civilized precedents, although if we are to judge from the statements of one party to the controversy, there is nothing barbarous that he has committed in this war that can not be duplicated by the conduct of Great Britain in South Africa. He seems advanced enough, however, to fight for his freedom. Give him the benefit of that.

I have seen this spirit called somewhere, and I think admirably called, the "unconquerable spirit." It is the spirit that kept George Washington fighting after Valley Forge. It is the spirit which animates De Wet to-day in South Africa after the organization of the republican armies has been destroyed and they have been broken up into bands of roving patriots. It is the same spirit which, according to the reports of our own generals, has broken down tribal lines and made the people of the Philippines unanimous in their hostility to this nation. It is the same spirit which would have shown itself in Cuba had we turned our war of deliverance in that country, as we did in Asia, into one of conquest. Those who think that the Filipinos continue to wage against us the war we purchased from Spain because of some speech made by somebody against the treaty have read history to but little purpose, if, indeed, they have read it at all. They are inspired by that same unconquerable spirit which is the noblest heritage of the human heart, which I am glad to believe is universal; it is man's best title to freedom, and that is the spirit to wage unrelenting war in behalf of liberty.

The Empire of Great Britain never attained a loftier moral stature than when, after Majuba Hill, she showed herself willing to do justice to the Boers. Standing almost peerless in physical strength among the nations, she displayed that nobler and more essential quality of greatness when after a reverse she yet listened to the demands of that weak little republic in South Africa. That act of Gladstone's strengthened his country in the hearts of men the world over; and it will shine in history all the more brightly in contrast with the brutal and merciless policy of extermination which is now shocking the sensibilities of Christendom. But how much easier is it for us to-day to pursue a policy of justice? We have suffered no reverse, or none indeed unless it be a moral one which our own conduct has inflicted. The organized armies have been dispersed. The Filipino leader, whom we bore to Luzon with arms in one of our own ships, has been driven by us to the caves of the mountains, if indeed he yet lives. The time has come when we should frankly declare to those people our ultimate purpose toward them. Let us give them that assurance which all our history inspires. Let us tell them that we will aid them for one year—for five years if need be—in setting up a government of their own, symbolized by their own flag, and that we will leave with them all that is most glorious in the meaning of another flag—liberty, independence, self-government. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HULL. There is still some time remaining, I believe, for debate on the other side.

Mr. SULZER. I trust the gentleman from Iowa will now consume some of his time.

Mr. HULL. The chances are that we shall not want to consume all our time. We want the right to close this debate.

Mr. SULZER. I hope the gentleman will take some of his time now.

Mr. HULL. Are there not some gentlemen on the other side desiring to occupy the floor?

Mr. SULZER. Oh, yes; but the gentleman who wanted to speak just now is not in the Hall at present.

Mr. HULL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that we shall want on this side more than ten or fifteen minutes. I think the gentlemen on the other side, if they desire to speak, ought to proceed now. We certainly have the right to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. HULL. I think so. I have not had any applications from gentlemen on this side desiring to speak. I do not wish to occupy, myself, any great amount of time. For this reason I would like gentlemen on the other side to conclude their remarks or yield the floor, in order that I may close the debate.

Mr. SULZER. I hope the gentleman will consume some of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa says that he only wants to close the debate, which he is entitled to do.

Mr. SULZER. How much time will the gentleman occupy in closing the debate?

Mr. HULL. I should say twenty minutes at the outside.

Mr. SULZER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS].

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, after a casual reading of this bill, it seems to me that in its preparation the interests of the seaboard States have been entirely overlooked. We have appropriated and expended nearly \$100,000,000 for the construction of coast defenses and for making guns with which to repel attack and defend them. I understand that to properly man these defenses the artillery branch of the service must be increased to 18,000 men. This bill fails to make the required increase. It proposes to increase the number of our cavalry regiments from ten to fifteen. It seems to me that the proper method of providing for an increase in the Army at this time is to promptly provide for the manning of our coast defenses. Billions of dollars in property are at stake in the cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Charleston, Savannah, New Orleans, and San Francisco. The looting spirit is abroad among the nations, and we can not take action too soon. It seems to me that it would be prudent to carry out the system already adopted of building coast defenses, of supplying them with the most formidable guns, and of manning them with a superior force of artillery.

I would like to vote for this bill if it provided for a proper increase of the Army by the adoption of measures putting the artillery, and not cavalry, to the front. The cavalry ought not to be increased at the expense of the artillery. Even the infantry regiments have no corresponding increase with the cavalry.

This ought not to be a bill drawn up in the interest of horse dealers. I hope, sir, that before the bill is brought to a vote the proper increase in the artillery will be made. Then the people and property on our coasts will be comparatively safe, and the nation itself bid defiance to the armies and navies of Europe.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and Mr. SHOWALTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 1358. An act to authorize the use of depositions before naval courts in certain cases;

S. 2399. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the diocese of Washington;"

S. 4284. An act to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, Superintendent of Foreign Mails, Post-Office Department, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Emperor of Germany;

S. 4439. An act to authorize Hon. George D. Meiklejohn, Assistant Secretary of War, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Government of Sweden and Norway;

S. 4673. An act to encourage the holding of an interstate and West Indian exposition in the city of Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, in the year 1901;

S. 4890. An act to correct the military record of Ira J. Paxton;

S. 21. An act for the relief of Clara H. Fulford;

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 12283) in relation to the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the permanent seat of government in the District of Columbia.

#### ARMY BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SULZER. I yield the balance of the time to my colleague on the committee [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, what I may say about this bill will be of a general character. In the few minutes which I shall occupy I am not going to enter into a discussion of the details of the measure. When the last Army bill was passed through this House, calling for a volunteer force of 35,000 men, I foresaw what would be the end. What is your proposition now? Let it be distinctly understood by the country. It is to increase your standing army to about 96,000. If any gentleman on the Republican side thinks that I am making a mistake in my figures, I will thank him very kindly for a correction. You propose to increase your standing army to 96,000 men. Now, I want to ask, what is that done for?



What is the object? What is the point that you expect to accomplish by making a standing army of 96,000? Why, sir, but a short time ago our Regular Army was down to between 20,000 and 25,000 men. I desire to emphasize the question, and I call upon some one to answer it. What do you want with a standing army of 96,000 men? The question is unnecessary; we do not need such an army.

But let me go one step further on this matter; and I am surprised that the chairman of our committee is not at this moment on the floor, for he is generally ready to answer everything, whether he answers it right or not. [Laughter.] I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I want the country to understand the position of the gentleman. I have no politics in this matter myself. What would you want with an army of 96,000 men? I wish the chairman of the committee would tell me.

Mr. HULL. I suppose the country will understand, Mr. Chairman, that we want an army to enforce the authority and maintain the power of the United States of America over every foot of soil that belongs to the United States and is under its jurisdiction.

Mr. COX. I am glad to hear the gentleman. Then, you must have an army, let us say, of 96,000 men to enforce the authority of the United States over every foot of territory that you assume to control. I hope the question is squarely put now before the House and before the people. Now, in this connection, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if, under a former bill, when he called for 35,000 volunteers, he did not say that it was plenty to assert the jurisdiction of the United States and to enable it to exercise control over every foot of territory that Congress claimed jurisdiction over. I want to meet this face to face. I do not want any sophistry about the matter. Let us come down to the plain question. What do you want with such an army?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have waited for a reply, but the gentleman seems to acquiesce in what I have just said, and he does not give me much trouble in his responses. But let us understand the question squarely and honestly. Do you intend to increase the standing army of the United States to 96,000 men—we will call it hereafter 100,000 men, for that is more like the number, and that is what you mean by the bill—do you intend, when you increase the standing army—and I ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to answer me—to go into war with anybody? What do you want with the increase? Who are you going to fight? [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, I get no response. Our chairman, always so ready on the floor, seems to be in trouble.

Mr. HULL. I did not understand the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee, my attention having been temporarily attracted.

Mr. COX. Well, I will make it so plain that you can not misunderstand it.

Mr. HULL. Well, you will have to be very plain indeed.

Mr. COX. I intend to be. I do not deal in sophistry. I make the inquiry plainly. If you increase the Army to 96,000, what are you going to increase the Army to 96,000 men for? What are you going to do with them?

Mr. HULL. Well, I will state to the gentleman that they will largely take the place of the hundred thousand men our friends on the other side aided to give us in the last two or three years.

Mr. COX. Oh, well, now, there is no dodging about that. [Laughter.] Let me see if I understand the thing properly. You increase the Army to 96,000 men—the Regular Army. Now what are you going to do with them? Who are you going to fight? Who are you going to whip? [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it seems that gentlemen in charge of the bill are absolutely void of an answer. What is the matter with our chairman? [Laughter.]

But I will come to a question that is plain and tangible and about which there can be no dodging. The chairman knows that I do not believe in a regular standing army of 96,000 men. Well, if you have a standing army of 96,000 men or 100,000 men, whom are you going to fight? Is any man ready to tell me whom is going to be fought by this army? Who is fighting us now? Give us an honest, common-sense reason and a fair answer to the inquiry. Whom are you going to fight? [Laughter.] Get up in your place and say that you have a proposition for an army of 96,000 men to fight somebody, and tell us whom it is that you are going to fight. [Laughter and applause.] Well, what is the matter with you over there? [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I have got it pretty near to a point, evidently. I repeat the inquiry again; the gentleman can not escape it. If you want an army of 100,000 or 96,000 men, call it as you please, whom are you going to fight? [Renewed laughter and applause.]

I heard Speaker Reed say one thing which struck me forcibly at one time. He is a man that I have a great deal of respect for—a man of genius, and intelligence, and judgment. He said to us over here, "I pity you poor fellows; you don't know what to say." Now, what in the world is the matter with you gentlemen over there? [Laughter.] Whom are you going to fight? [Applause.] Now, I never was in favor of this war against the Filipinos. My record shows how I stood; but the country seems to

have declared in favor of it. Gentlemen on the other side, you stand there like a set of dummies and will not tell us whom you are going to fight. [Laughter.] What is the matter with you? If you are not going to fight anybody, what do you want of an army? I should like to hear the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs answer that question. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who is a warm personal friend of mine, whom are you going to fight? Do you want to catch Aguinaldo?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not wonder that the gentleman asks the question, because we have whipped almost everything in sight. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Well, if you have whipped everything in sight, what do you want with an army of a hundred thousand men? [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to produce any pleasantries at all, but it seems to me that the question which I have asked is one that gentlemen can not answer. Gentlemen may say I have but one idea, but that is a better one than a good many men in this Congress have. You want to increase the standing army. When you undertook to increase the regiments in the artillery division, I called your attention to the fact that you can never reduce a standing army after you have once created it.

Whenever the institutions of the United States are threatened and it is necessary to protect them, give me the old volunteer soldier, with his own regimental officers and his own company officers, every time. There never was a battle fought in the United States—in the civil war or in any of our foreign wars—in which the victory was not achieved by our volunteers. I am not afraid of Tennesseans failing to defend the flag. We hold the proud distinction of being the banner volunteer State. That means that the citizens of the United States are ready to defend their Government whenever called upon. Is there a Republican over on the other side who says that is wrong? You can not maintain the United States as a republican government without the assistance or sanction of the volunteers. Talk as you may, I have no criticisms to make about our Army. It is good to a certain extent; it is bad to another extent; but if I had to fight a war for the United States, give me the old volunteer. Even if he had not been in the service more than three days I would depend on him. He would shoot.

Now, in conclusion, I wish to say a few words. When the last bill was under consideration by this House, I asked my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] what he wanted with 35,000 volunteers. He said they would show us after a while. Now, I want to know what are you going to do with an army of 96,000? Whom are you going to fight? I can not keep away from that question. Are you going to shoot the Filipinos? Is that your intention? Let me ask you one simple, common-sense question. What did the Filipinos ever do to us that should make you want to shoot them? When we were fighting Spain you thought they were very good allies. I say now, as I said when the first bill came to this House, I will not vote to take away the money from an honest soldier who is called into the service.

In my ten years' experience no man has ever heard me raise my voice or my hand against the old soldier, I do not care which side he was on. But if you are going to call out your 96,000 men to shoot the Filipinos, who are fighting for what we fought for, I will never vote a nickel for that proposition.

I beg you to remember one thing. You will never be able, after you have increased your standing army, to reduce it. You will never be able to create a great army and then reduce it. The circumstances which surround it make that impossible. But if you want to conquer the Filipinos and that is your idea, I think it will take you longer than you think. I am not in politics any more, and I want to call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that I will never vote a dollar to shoot a man who is fighting in favor of his own independence. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CUMMINGS] in his remarks upon the bill said he would vote for a bill if it created 18,000 artillerymen to man our coast defenses. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the provisions of the bill making the artillery corps 18,920 men, both as a maximum and a minimum. The bill provides against any reduction in that corps when the Army shall be reduced. In this respect the bill meets every want of the gentleman from New York.

So that the gentleman's objection to the bill is entirely overcome by the provision itself. There is to be a reduction in the infantry and cavalry when the Army comes to its minimum, but none whatever in the artillery; and the increase in the artillery is made from year to year, precisely as the necessities of the Government require by the completion of the coast defenses. This estimate is made by officers who know what the needs of the Government will be.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], Mr. Chairman, seems to misapprehend the character of the measure before the House. It is not a question as to what we want to do or



what will be done in the way of trade or future policy. It is a question of what the demands of the Government require to-day under the conditions confronting us. The war that we undertook was not a partisan one. All parties were for it. The results of the war, by which we have acquired territory, have been ratified by both Houses of Congress, after a treaty was negotiated, and the President of the United States, by his sworn duty to the people of the country, must maintain the authority of this Government over every foot of our territory as long as it remains our territory.

What shall be done in the future remains for this Congress or future Congresses to determine. What shall be done to-day is to maintain the authority of the Government, not only upon the mainland, but upon all the islands of the sea where our flag floats by authority of law [applause]; and when the gentleman from Massachusetts weighs the cost against what we are compelled to do in honor, it seems to me that he weighs dollars against the honor of this great Republic. [Renewed applause.] So far as I am concerned as an individual, I believe we will maintain our authority upon the Philippine Islands as long as the Republic endures.

Whether that will be the policy of the Government or not depends upon the wishes of the people of the United States in the future. But, Mr. Chairman, as long as they are ours we disgrace ourselves at home and abroad or we have got to supply the necessary force to maintain our authority. The gentleman speaks about fighting the Filipinos. We are. Why? Because they are fighting us. We did not begin it; we tried to avoid it.

With infinite patience and, as it seems to me, with great wisdom the President kept from organizing the larger force until the very last moment, hoping by his generous concessions for self-government and the liberty that would bring to them would obviate the necessity of organizing the extra 35,000 men; and they were only organized because the people in the islands, subject to the authority of the Government just as much as our people are, refused to yield assent to the demands of the constituted authorities of the United States. If the President had been anxious for a large army he would at once have organized the full force.

You talk about the Filipino establishing a government. Let them demonstrate the fact of their ability before turning it over to them. The opportunity is offered them by the wise and humane policy of the President to exercise local government. They refuse. We are there to-day, and have been there every day since we acquired our sovereignty, affording a local government so far as it has been possible to give it to them, and have gone to the extreme, in my judgment, in trying to induce these people to exercise local government. They have preferred lawlessness to order, murder and arson to settled conditions, and pillage to labor.

You talk about people fighting for their liberties. My good friends, let me say this to you, that the few numbers engaged in hostilities as against the United States Government do not demonstrate that the people of this country are forcing their sovereignty over an unwilling people. Less than 5 per cent of the Tagalog tribe are in revolt against our authority. All the rest of them are anxious to pursue the avocations of peace supported by the authority of the United States; and the time will not come when the people of this great Republic will treat on any terms whatever with any people of the islands in rebellion until they lay down their arms and acknowledge the jurisdiction of this country. The people of the United States are generous, but they are not cowards.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman before I conclude.

This condition confronts us, and this only, in my mind: We are in the Philippine Islands by solemn treaty. We are there under the sanction of law enacted by the Senate and House. Our power and our jurisdiction is as absolute there as in any part of the United States. We have over 60,000 troops in the Philippine Islands who are soon to be brought home. If you withdraw those troops from those stations without replacing them with others, you expose to murder every friend of this Government in the Philippine Islands. You destroy our authority. You encourage rebellion, and sow seeds in the future of untold loss of blood and treasure by such action. That is what confronts this Congress. Now I will listen to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. COX. If there is only 5 per cent of the Filipinos, as you say, that resist the Government of the United States, why do you want an army of 96,000 men? [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. I am delighted if I can only enlighten my friend on that. A very small per cent in a country like the Philippines, without a government, as we understand the name, acting as brigands, rushing in and destroying property and killing their own kinsmen for friendship to us, can cover a large space of country and will require a considerable number of troops to protect them adequately, and this Government has taken on itself the obligation to protect established government in the Philippine

Islands. I did not say 5 per cent of the 12,000,000 of inhabitants. That would be a larger number than our Army. It is not quite 5 per cent of the Tagalos tribe, which is about 1,000,000.

Mr. COX. I said that you said there was only about 5 per cent of the Filipinos resisting the authority of the United States.

Mr. HULL. I will qualify that if it will help my friend out by saying that it is not 5 per cent of the Tagalos tribe alone. But even if it were 5 per cent of the entire island, it strikes me that the other 95 per cent ought to have some consideration from so distinguished a patriot as my friend from Tennessee. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Will my friend yield—

Mr. HULL. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Does not the gentleman from Iowa think that a permanent declaration of what our policy will be in regard to the islands would tend to pacify them?

Mr. HULL. I think not. I think it would have no effect at all, unless you had such a guaranty as that given by your late candidate for the Presidency, that we would stand between them and all foreign nations and let them play the devil with the people.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the gentleman think it would have no effect, beneficial or not, upon the people of the Philippine Islands? Is it not a matter to be desired?

Mr. HULL. I think the greatest mistake—

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I have not finished. Is it not a matter to be desired, since a permanent declaration of the policy of the Administration is desired by a great portion of this country and one that would give the inhabitants all the elements of our citizenship?

Mr. HULL. I want to say that they have had every assurance by proclamation that the largest measure of self-government of which they are capable would be granted to them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But what does that amount to?

Mr. HULL. The gentleman from Mississippi may say that they are as civilized as the rest of the world, but the testimony of the men who have been there is that they are not capable of self-government; that their idea of liberty is only the liberty to cut their enemies' throats. Now, we can wait until we reach the proper degree of information; let Congress take up that when they reach it. The idea that the Army has got to wait until such questions have been determined in the future is rather far-fetched.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Why not make the establishment for the Philippine war?

Mr. HULL. Because we do not want to. This army is for the United States of America, and will go wherever the authority of the Government extends, and do what the necessities of the Government require. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. During the war between the States you enlisted men for this war.

Mr. HULL. That was a well-defined job we had to do, and it took us a good while to finish it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As a matter of fact, between you and me, outside of the Philippine question, independently of it and beyond it, do you not want 90,000 men for a standing army?

Mr. HULL. Beyond it? No; most emphatically no. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall] stated that it would require an act of Congress to compel the President to reduce the number because the bill makes it a permanent army of 100,000 men. What does the bill say? It says:

That the President is authorized to maintain the enlisted force of the several organizations of the Army at their maximum strength as fixed by this act during the present exigencies of the service, or until such time as Congress may hereafter direct.

Do you think that is an unusual thing? Why, my good Democratic friends, from the day of George Washington to the present time the Congress of the United States has put the Army up and down at its own pleasure.

Mr. KING. Has the President done so?

Mr. HULL. Yes, repeatedly, and been authorized to do it. But even if he does not, the whole question is in the hands of Congress. Gentlemen seem to forget that we have a three years' enlistment. About one-third of the entire force of the Regular Army goes out every year. You talk as though you could not refuse to appropriate because men are enlisted for three years. You can stop the enlistment any year and one-third will step out. Another year you can stop another third. You have the power in your own hands all the time. You talk as though this was as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Two years ago we passed a bill giving 100,000 men for two years, and a larger number of officers by nearly 500 than this bill provides for.

Mr. SULZER rose.

Mr. HULL. I decline to yield at present.

Mr. SULZER. I simply want to ask whether the gentleman will consent to that now?

Mr. HULL. No; that is easily answered.



Mr. HAY rose.

Mr. HULL. In one moment I will yield to my friend from Virginia [Mr. HAY], whom I am always delighted to work with and sorry when I disagree with him.

We took that bill. At that time every man in the Senate and House conceded that we needed an army of 100,000 men. Gentlemen said that in two years they could tell what we needed as a permanent army. You [addressing the Democratic side] cost the Government at least \$25,000,000 additional by your bill beyond what our bill would have cost.

Mr. WHEELER. And you cost the Government three hundred millions by refusing to declare your policy.

Mr. HULL. Our Democratic friends want to know why it would not be well to limit this increase of the Army to two years. I say that if we provide for a permanent establishment, then if we need this army two years from now, we shall have it, without the large expense of recruiting a new army; and if we do not need it, the matter will adjust itself without any harm to the Government.

Mr. HAY. Now will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman has stated on three different occasions that our party forced upon the country the bill which is now in operation, and thereby caused a great deal of the expense which has been incurred. I want to ask him whether his party at that time did not have a majority in the House and in the Senate, and whether they had not a President of their own party? How, then, can the responsibility for legislation enacted at that time be shifted upon the shoulders of gentlemen on this side of the House?

Mr. HULL. It is true, as the gentleman has said, that we had a majority in this House and that we had the President of the United States, but those other gentlemen had the Senate—

Mr. HAY. No, we had not.

Mr. HULL. And the Senate notified us that unless we accepted their compromise, bad as it was, the defects of which were pointed out in debate here and fully recognized, we could go without an army; that they could talk in the Senate until the 4th of March, and thus force an extra session. We accepted that measure simply as a temporary makeshift. We ought not to have accepted it. But now you gentlemen want to continue that same expensive, worthless system of makeshifts from year to year, in order to go before the people trying to frighten them with the idea of a great standing army. You gentlemen tried that in the last campaign, and I should imagine that the average Democrat had had all of that kind of amusement he would want, because in every place where the question was discussed the people said, "Give the President every man he wants to maintain the authority of this Government." [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Does the gentleman think it fair to allude to the last election?

Mr. HULL. No; it is not. It is never proper to speak disrespectfully of the dead. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as the policy of this Government in regard to the future is concerned, this Congress can not establish that absolutely. The next Congress can do as it pleases in these matters. But this one thing is sure—that the people of the United States have never yet turned down a party that believed in growth and expansion and in the dignity and power and majesty of the people of the United States. They believe in their flag, in their institutions; they believe in our future. The party that has no better thing to appeal to than prejudice and reaction and opposition can never hope to rule in this Republic. [Applause.]

There is one other thing to which I wish to refer. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall] referred to the great cost of the Army of the United States. Gentlemen, it does cost more to support a United States soldier than it does to support the soldier of any other nation on earth. Thank God for that. Germany pays her soldiers, if I remember rightly, about \$2.50 a month; Austria, about 90 cents a month; France, about \$2.50 a month; England, \$9 a month. At the same time these nations manage, by a series of fines, to bring the private out about even with the Government every month. We do not believe in that kind of thing. We have no compulsory military service in this country. Our soldier is the volunteer; whether you call him a regular or not, he is a volunteer. Both the volunteer and the regular are citizens of the Republic. Each of them enlists by his own volition; each of them must furnish a certificate of good character.

Would my friend from Massachusetts advocate giving to our soldiers what is now given to the soldiers of the Old World? We have not acted that way in regard to the labor of the United States. His State has been built up into a great hive of industry by putting into practice the American theory that an American citizen is entitled to higher wages than any other man on earth. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts in favor of reducing our soldiers to a level with the European soldier because he is afraid of the expense? Let me advise him, then, to remove the shield of

the Government from before the face of the workingman of Massachusetts and let him take his stand with the rest of the world. He would not last long as a statesman there if he advocated that.

Massachusetts has always had some man in public life opposed to every step forward. All through the course of our Indian wars Massachusetts had some man to advocate always the theory that we had no right to capture the wilds of the West. Massachusetts has always had some man afraid, as Phillips said once, to brush the cobwebs from the rafters for fear the roof of the house would fall in. Massachusetts has always had men in great crises to oppose the onward march of the Republic. Some of her citizens did this in 1814, and have done it at every opportunity since. But, thank God, the heart of the great old Commonwealth has always been true to the best interests of the country, and her people have been against her recreant sons.

Mr. COX. Now I want to ask the gentleman a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, my friend from Tennessee and I have had so many interesting seances in the committee that I hope he will not bring them up here on the floor of the House.

Mr. COX. I only want to ask you a short question.

Mr. HULL. I can not find it in my heart to decline to yield to my friend.

Mr. COX. I am sorry that the chairman of the committee will not allow me—

Mr. HULL. I have yielded and yielded to the gentleman. I am always glad to yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. COX. Well, I do not find that the gentleman has overburdened himself in yielding to me to-day. [Laughter.]

But my point is this: That so far as the soldier is concerned, I have never said a word in Congress against any soldier; I do not care on which side he fought.

Now, then, what do you want with these soldiers? [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. I tried to explain to the gentleman from Tennessee why we wanted the Army more than once during the course of my remarks, and if, after all that has been said upon that subject in the committee and on the floor of the House, he is not satisfied, I am afraid to enter upon a further explanation for his benefit. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to put in the RECORD a table showing the cost of the different armies of the world, the per diem pay of the soldier in the different armies of the world, and a general table showing the expenses of the armies of different countries, which I understand I have a right to submit at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa will be permitted to print such tables as he may desire in connection with the pending bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. The general debate being now ended, I ask for the reading of the bill by paragraphs.

The Clerk read as follows:

That from and after the approval of this bill the Army of the United States shall consist of 15 regiments of cavalry, a corps of artillery, 30 regiments of infantry, 1 Lieutenant-General, 6 major-generals, 15 brigadier-generals, an Adjutant-General's Department, an Inspector-General's Department, a Judge-Advocate-General's Department, a Quartermaster's Department, a Subsistence Department, a Medical Department, a Pay Department, an Engineer Corps, an Ordnance Department, a Signal Corps, the officers of the Record and Pension Office, the chaplains, the officers and enlisted men of the Army on the retired list, the professors, corps of cadets, the army-service detachment and band at the United States Military Academy, and such other officers and enlisted men as may hereinafter be provided for: *Provided*, That when a vacancy shall occur through death, retirement, or other separation from active service in the office of storekeeper, now provided for by law in the Quartermaster's Department and Ordnance Department, respectively, said office shall cease to exist.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is the bill now being read for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DALZELL). It is.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send it up. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "exist," in line 11, page 11, the following:

"*Provided*, That any vacancy in the offices of the Pay Department, the Quartermaster's Department, the Ordnance Department, or Medical Department may be filled by appointment from the Army or from civil life."

Mr. HEPBURN. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, from the examination that I have been able to make of this bill—

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding further, I raise the point of order to this amendment that it is not germane to this paragraph, because this simply goes on to tell what shall comprise the Army. There are sections further on in the bill which tell how the different corps shall be filled. There is certainly nothing in this paragraph that would justify an amendment of this character.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not think it makes any difference where it comes. It is pertinent here.



Mr. HULL. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that this paragraph simply deals with the general statement of what the Army shall consist of, without any reference whatever to the matter covered by the amendment, without any reference whatever to how the different departments shall be constituted, and that other sections of the bill deal with that question, which will be reached as we progress.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not think there is any other section where it would be more appropriate than here. There is clearly nothing in the nature of this bill to prohibit an amendment of the character I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Iowa to say that there is a point in the bill where such an amendment would be germane?

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes. There are sections that deal with the question how these different forces shall be made up. All the staff corps have specific provisions in the bill as to how they shall be constituted. This section does not deal with that question at all, but simply deals with the question what corps and divisions shall comprise the Army, without regard to the make-up of the different divisions.

Mr. HEPBURN. What sections does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. HULL. There are sections relating to the Pay Department and to all the other departments.

Mr. HEPBURN. But each section applies to a specific corps.

Mr. HULL. Yes, and you can strike out that provision and make any general provision that you desire.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Sections 26, 27, and 28 relate especially to the subject.

Mr. HULL. Certainly, sections 26, 27, and 28 relate to the details. The gentleman could move to strike out those sections and put in the provision which he has offered. The amendment certainly is not in order at this part of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will submit to the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point is well taken, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then, I will offer the amendment at the proper time.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That the enlisted force of the Corps of Engineers shall consist of one band and three battalions of engineers. The engineers band shall be organized as now provided by law for bands of infantry regiments. Each battalion of engineers shall consist of 1 sergeant-major, 1 quartermaster-sergeant, and 4 companies. Each company of engineers shall consist of 1 first sergeant; 1 quartermaster-sergeant, with the rank, pay, and allowances of sergeant; 8 sergeants, 10 corporals, 2 musicians, 2 cooks, 38 first-class and 38 second-class privates: *Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, increase the number of sergeants in any company of engineers to 12, the number of corporals to 18, the number of first-class privates to 64, and the number of second-class privates to 64, but the total number of enlisted men authorized for the whole Army shall not, at any time, be exceeded.

Mr. HULL. In the first line of section 11 the letter "s" has been dropped off from the word "engineer," which should be "engineers."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment suggested by the gentleman will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. That the Judge-Advocate-General's Department shall consist of one Judge-Advocate-General with the rank of brigadier-general, two judge-advocates with the rank of colonel, three judge-advocates with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, six judge-advocates with the rank of major, and for each geographical department or tactical division of troops not provided with a judge-advocate from the list of officers holding permanent commissions in the Judge-Advocate-General's Department one judge-advocate with the rank, pay, and allowances of captain, mounted. Promotions to vacancies above the grade of major, created or caused by this act, shall be made, according to the rules of seniority, from officers now holding commission in the Judge-Advocate-General's Department. Vacancies created or caused by this act in the grade of major may be filled by appointment of officers holding commissions as judge-advocate of volunteers since April 21, 1897, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. Vacancies which may occur hereafter in the grade of major in the Judge-Advocate-General's Department shall be filled by selection of officers of the line.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to lines 17 and 18 in section 15 on page 19, to the words "under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War." My amendment is to strike out the words which I have quoted.

Mr. HULL. The same words appear in all of the sections relating to the staff corps that are open to appointment from civil life. The President makes the appointments. I understand the idea of my friend from Illinois is that if the President makes the appointment, and it is confirmed by the Senate, that ought to be sufficient without the limitation which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has quoted. The committee have no objection to striking that out, and have no feeling about it one way or the other. Those words were simply put in because the sections were sent to us in that form.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that my reason for offering the amendment is that if a man has performed service in the war with Spain or in the Philippines, in the Volunteer Army, and if the President appoints such an officer and the Senate con-

firms the appointment, that man ought to go into the service without the consent of the Secretary of War, and without any regulations that might be made from the standpoint, perhaps, of some martinet in the service, if there be any such. Possibly there may be officers who have done service in the Philippines in the Volunteer Army that may not be able to calculate the distance from the earth to the sun, but who are good soldiers in fact, and could do good service after their nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion about physical examination, health, etc.? These are usual regulations.

Mr. CANNON. I think we can trust the President and the Senate. Given the volunteer officer, given the vacancy under this Army bill that we are now proposing to pass, it seems to me the President and the Senate could be trusted, without adding qualifications that might be equal to a civil-service examination, and perhaps much more severe, and bar out, perchance, worthy volunteer officers. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 19, lines 17 and 18, strike out the words "under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to amend, in the same line, 17, by striking out the word "seven" and inserting the word "eight." It is 1898 all the way through the bill, and it was intended to be that here.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "ninety-seven" and insert the word "ninety-eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. That the Quartermaster's Department shall consist of 1 Quartermaster-General with the rank of brigadier-general, 6 quartermasters with the rank of colonel, 9 quartermasters with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, 18 quartermasters with the rank of major, 54 quartermasters with the rank of captain, mounted; the military storekeeper now provided for by law, and 150 post quartermaster-sergeants: *Provided*, That all vacancies in the grade of colonel, lieutenant-colonel, and major created or caused by this section shall be filled by promotion according to seniority, as now prescribed by law. That to fill vacancies in the grade of captain created by this act in the Quartermaster's Department the President is authorized to appoint officers of volunteers commissioned since April 21, 1898, and whose professional and physical fitness have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, in order to make the bill conform to the amendment just adopted, I move to strike out all after the word "ninety-eight," in lines 21, 22, and 23:

And whose professional and physical fitness have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. SLAYDEN. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa this question: Would not it meet the purpose of your amendment and at the same time preserve some little security in the matter of physical fitness if you merely strike out the words "to the satisfaction of the Secretary of War?"

Mr. HULL. I assume that a man who has made his record by actual service will not be put in the Army by the President if he is an unfit man to go in.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The President may not be informed.

Mr. HULL. The War Department has the whole record with it, and before a single man is appointed the President will have this record. The fear of some gentlemen was that by setting up a stiff technical examination for a volunteer quartermaster or commissary or others it would be impossible for the volunteer to pass the examination unless he was a graduate and recent graduate of some college. Personally I do not believe there is a particle of danger of that, but with the words out or not the President will undoubtedly inquire into the efficiency of every man now in the Army presented to him for commission in the Regular Army, and the Senate will undoubtedly make examination on their own account before voting to confirm.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is stricken out and left entirely out of the bill, does it not still leave with the President the right to prescribe any rule for physical examination?

Mr. HULL. No doubt. I do not think that it will make any change at all, but it obviates some objection made to the bill on this side, and as it does no harm to the service, I am willing that it shall go out.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Quartermaster's Department, transmitted to me by the Secretary of War, and I desire to offer an amendment after conferring with some members of the committee, but I do not offer it as a committee amendment. I have no authority to offer it as such. The Secretary of War sends it to me with the simple statement that the Department sending up their propositions, in considering the number of officers provided for their departments in the pending bill for the reorganization of the Army, claim that the number which was



submitted was insufficient. I will now ask to have read the letter from the Quartermaster-General, which will give all the information I could possibly give and more.

The letter was read, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
Washington, December 3, 1900.

SIR: In referring to the advance copy of the proposed bill, prepared by the War Department, for the reorganization of the Army of the United States, it is observed that the bill provides for only 88 officers for the Quartermaster's Department. This number is so inadequate, in the judgment of the undersigned, that special attention is called thereto.

The department has now 123 officers, including both regulars and volunteers. After a most careful consideration of this subject, this office reported to the Secretary of War, in letter of August 25 last, that a reduction of 6 officers might be made without detriment to the service. The War department bill provides for a reduction of 40 officers from the number now in service. Considering the magnitude and importance of the work with which this department is charged, covering at this time the supply of troops in the United States, Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, China, and the Philippines, with the great supply depots and the transport service to be efficiently managed and maintained, and the enormous quantities of quartermaster supplies to be constantly purchased, inspected, and distributed, this reduction—in the opinion of the Quartermaster-General—can not be made without resulting in great injury to the public service.

In this connection I desire to state that since the beginning of the Spanish-American war this department has been frequently embarrassed in finding officers to meet all the requirements of the service, and at this time there is not a single officer fit for duty unassigned. The chief quartermaster at Manila has recently informed me that other officers of the Quartermaster's Department will be constantly required there to take the place of those rendered unfit for duty by reason of the unfavorable climatic conditions incident to Philippine service.

In view of the foregoing, I feel that I would be derelict in my public duty did I not call attention to this matter, with a view to rectifying what may be an oversight in fixing, in the proposed Army reorganization measure, the small number of officers for this department. I regard 122 officers as the very lowest number which can properly and efficiently transact the business pertaining to this department, and earnestly urge and recommend that Congress be requested to supply that number. This department can not be expected to assume the great responsibility resting upon it by law and regulations if an adequate force of officers is not furnished by Congress to perform the work.

I further call attention to the age limit provided in the proposed bill at which volunteer quartermasters will be allowed to receive appointment in the permanent establishment of the department. This limit will prevent a large majority of the most valuable volunteer officers from being appointed, thereby depriving the department of their experience and services. Many of the volunteer officers have been performing such efficient and responsible duties since the beginning of the war with Spain that they are, in my judgment, entitled to special consideration, and it is hoped and recommended that this bar to the appointment of the most meritorious of these officers be eliminated from the bill, leaving to the Secretary of War and the President, in their discretion, the consideration of each case on its merits as to whether appointment in the regular establishment would or would not enhance the public interests.

I notice also in this proposed measure that a very small increase in the higher grades of this department is provided for. It seems proper that the Quartermaster's Department, composed of 122 officers, should have a greater proportion of colonels, lieutenant-colonels, and majors than a staff corps having but half or a fourth of this number of officers. I hope, therefore, that this may be rectified, and that the higher grades be fixed and this department established on the basis recommended in my communication of August 25 last, viz, 1 brigadier-general, 8 colonels, 16 lieutenant-colonels, 30 majors, and 67 captains. The military storekeeper will retire early in January next, and the vacancy will not be filled.

It is recommended that favorable consideration be given to the foregoing by the honorable the Secretary of War, and that this letter be transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House for consideration in connection with the Army reorganization measure now being framed by that committee.

Very respectfully,

M. I. LUDINGTON,  
Quartermaster-General United States Army.

The SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with those members of the committee I could reach, and believing that the Quartermaster-General's statement is correct, and that they should have more officers than this bill gives them, I move to amend the section by striking out the word "six," in line 9, and inserting the word "seven." That would make one additional colonel. Also, in line 10, strike out "nine" and insert "eleven;" and in line 11 strike out "fifty-four" and insert "seventy-two." That will give about 119. A hundred and twenty-two, he says, is what he absolutely needs, but he also, in his supplemental statement, says that 118 is the closest approach to the danger line that it is possible to run and administer his Department.

Mr. BROMWELL. I have not heard you make any change in the number of majors.

Mr. HULL. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. I thought I included them. There should be twenty-eight. I move to strike out in lines 10 and 11 the word "eighteen" and insert "twenty-eight."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, page 20, strike out the word "six" and insert "seven."

In line 10 strike out "nine" and insert "eleven."

At the end of line 11 strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty-eight."

In line 11 strike out "fifty-four" and insert "seventy-two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, in examining the bill since I called the attention of the committee to the amendment I offered, I am unable to find any place where the gentleman from Iowa

might not make a captious objection on the ground of want of similarity if he saw fit, and it may be that I will have to divide the amendment I want to make.

Mr. HULL. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa if he is not willing to let this go over and examine sections 36 and 37 of the bill, which is in regard to the detail system.

Mr. HEPBURN. By dividing my amendment there is one part of it which I am satisfied is germane to this paragraph, and I offer to amend by adding to the end of the paragraph the following, "Provided, That any vacancy in the Quartermaster's Department may be filled by appointment from civil life or from volunteers serving since April 21, 1898."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That any vacancy in the Quartermaster's Department may be filled by appointment from civil life or from volunteers serving since April 21, 1898.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered affects the Quartermaster's Department, the Subsistence Department, the Pay Department, and the Medical Department, the four departments that may properly be called the supply departments of the Army, and the departments that do not require for the efficient discharge of the duties military science or military knowledge and experience. On the contrary, what is wanted in these departments is a business capacity as distinguished from a military capacity.

I am satisfied that I could cite instances in the history of this country during the last three years that show conclusively that the method which we have adopted for filling these four corps has not been a success. You will remember some two years ago it became necessary to send an expedition to the eastern end of the island of Cuba. Sixteen thousand men were sent. They were sent under the immediate control, or so far as the loading of their ships, furnishing them with supplies, under the control of the Quartermaster's Department. Yet we have authority for saying that in the fitting out of that expedition some parts of the battery would be sent on one ship, some parts on another, and again on a third ship would be a portion of the same battery. They were sent there without any method, or any means whatever for unloading, although it was known that they were to unload from a roadstead a mile or more from shore, and yet there were neither launches nor boats of any character to facilitate their unloading.

We were told at the time that it became necessary because of this inefficient action of the Quartermaster's Department to throw animals—mules and horses—into the sea a mile or more from shore, and some of them succeeded at last in reaching it, while others were lost by going in the wrong direction. We know that at the time we got the news of the first military performance on the east end of that island, that when we heard that complaints were made as to these things, that the responsibility was thrown upon the Quartermaster's Department that there was not sufficient means to transport supplies and to move the army after they got them on land. So that I say in my judgment it can not be claimed that this branch of the service is to be improved by adhering to the old methods of filling these corps.

I believe that the President ought to have the opportunity and the power of selecting efficient men without regard to their service in the Army. I can conceive of no reason why long experience in the military service adds materially to the fitness of an officer to discharge the duties of quartermaster. This is par excellence a business place, where you need activity and energy and good common sense, and where you need to be relieved, as far as possible, from the routine of red tape and from those methods that grow up after long years of usage and custom in a given line.

Mr. BROMWELL. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] to the reading of this paragraph, commencing on line 17. I think his proposed amendment will have to take the place of this last sentence, or else the sentence will have to be largely modified, because it is a proviso that vacancies in the grade of captain shall be filled by appointments from the volunteers, etc. The gentleman's provision is a general one for filling all vacancies.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have noticed what the gentleman states, but I want to see whether the House has any disposition whatever to adopt this amendment, and if so I shall be glad to have the assistance of the gentleman in making the bill conform to the general idea embraced in my proposition. And, Mr. Chairman, I may add that I would propose to apply this rule of appointment from civil life or from the volunteers to all four of the corps to which I have referred.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is necessary to enter upon a discussion of the amendment at this time. But I wish to say in reply to the gentleman's criticism of the Quartermaster's Department as to moving troops to Santiago without proper arrangements having been made in advance, that the very necessity of the case demanded that those troops should



be moved without proper arrangements having been provided. They could not be provided without long delay, and delay meant probable defeat of the movement. Transports were chartered and rushed down to Key West and from there to Santiago.

The Government had made no preparations whatever for moving troops by water up to the war with Spain. The necessity for an immediate advance was regarded as imperative, if our troops were to accomplish the great purpose which was afterwards accomplished. And when they reached Santiago there was no wharf for them to land at; there were no facilities for disembarking, although the Navy and the Army were cooperating in the transportation of troops and the landing of troops and supplies.

Mr. STEELE. The lighter was lost.

Mr. HULL. Yes; the lighter was lost.

If we had waited until preparations such as those suggested by the gentleman from Iowa had been made, the war might have been going on for some months after the time when it in fact closed and more suffering and loss of life entailed than was caused by the prompt advance.

But I appeal to the gentlemen whether it is not true that as soon as it was known what the Government needed in this line the Quartermaster's Department met all the requirements of that occasion, and of every occasion that came up, with a wonderful ability in providing for the transportation and care of troops on land and water.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to conclude this question to-night—

Mr. HEPBURN. One moment, before the gentleman makes the motion that the committee rise.

Mr. HULL. I withhold that motion, of course.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no disposition to criticize querulously any branch of the Army. I have as much pride in it and in the aggregate of its great performances as my colleague or anyone else. But I am not blind to certain defects in that organization, and I want to call my friend's attention to the fact that after the expedition to which I have referred was prepared for sailing it went back because of a report that a hostile fleet might be in the way, and remained for many days at Tampa. I insist that the gentleman who had charge of this expedition knew where the landing was to be; knew that there would be no wharf for them to land at; knew that the unloading of those vessels must be from the open sea; and under those circumstances efficient men would have had at hand the necessary facilities to carry on that proceeding in a proper and orderly way.

It will not do to say that those gentlemen, charged with that responsible duty, and who proved so derelict, had not knowledge of all the circumstances of the case. They knew all the surroundings; and I believe that if there had been an infusion of new blood in that force—if it had been possible for the President to call to his aid, as the Secretary of War in one instance did, men from the outside—the lamentable exhibition that was made would not have been made. I remember that when those grave duties incident to the Quartermaster's Department devolved with such suddenness upon the Secretary of War he did not rely upon the Regular Army or the Quartermaster's Department. He called to his aid business men from the outside, and it was they who provided the transports. They were the men who did the active duties that brought credit in the greatest degree to the performances of the Army.

It was by reason of the fact that the Secretary of War was able to do this at that time that we reaped such marked advantage as we did. I want to put in the power of the President in all instances the right to call to his aid efficient men; and I do not believe that our systems of Army life do give efficiency in business matters.

I am willing to say that military experience is essential in the command of troops, essential in the laying out of campaigns and in all matters of strategy; but there is no reason in the world why a man should become fitted for the duties of a quartermaster simply because he has been in the American Army. On the contrary, there are many reasons why he may become unfitted for the best discharge of the duties of the Quartermaster's Department.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa seems to assume, in the first place, that the Quartermaster's Department was perfectly organized for war when the war came, while it is well known that Congress had been, year after year since the close of the civil war, clipping off that and all other staff departments, here and there. Nearly all of the officers of the Quartermaster's Department had been taken from civil life, so that the very splendid efficiency of that department may help to bear out the argument of my colleague, but not his conclusions. They were trained men, but of such limited number as to make it impossible for them to do all the immense increase of work. Congress is to blame, not the department. We ignored the advice of every educated soldier, to provide a larger staff in peace than was absolutely needed, so that we could be

prepared for war, and crippled the staff corps even for a peace establishment.

We provided in the volunteer act for a large number of men from civil life, who were rushed into the service without preparation or previous training, who finally, in many instances, came to be most efficient officers, and the idea that the Quartermaster's Department, because the troops were brought back to Key West after starting, could provide for their landing in Cuba in advance of any knowledge of the place of landing shows that my friend has given but little thought to the matter.

Mr. HEPBURN. At all events, facilities for landing might have been provided.

Mr. HULL (continuing). And the Quartermaster's Department did not know where the troops were going. From the moment the troops were placed on the transport they were under the control of the General of the Army and under his orders and the military authorities here and at Tampa. It might have been a bad thing, but as a matter of fact it resulted at last in good. The Quartermaster's Department could not send men to Santiago in advance of the troops to provide a place of landing. They had no money for the accomplishment of that purpose assigned to them by the Secretary of War in the first place, and in the second place they would not have lived long after they had landed there and undertook to do the work under the circumstances then existing, without an army to protect them.

My friend will also remember that a lighter was provided and started off with the troops. This was wrecked, and would my friend say that they ought to wait and stop the expedition until another lighter could have been procured rather than take the chance of losing a mule by landing from the vessels as was done? We unloaded safely the food for the troops, the arms, and the men themselves. It was a matter of grave difficulty to furnish the rations to the men on the fighting line at first, but the organization of pack trains, composed of men and mules, which had been safely landed, in a little while enabled the Department to provide full rations for all the men engaged in the service on the fighting line.

The Army suffered a great deal, it is true. War means suffering in an active campaign; but the boys who did the fighting have not complained. They, the regulars and the volunteers, standing shoulder to shoulder on the fighting line, knew that the Government was doing everything that could be done in their behalf, and they were satisfied that there was no neglect or want of care as far as their interests were concerned. The capture of 22,000 Spanish soldiers by less than 17,000 American soldiers is a practical illustration of the capacity of the men who stood on the fighting line and endured the hardships and dangers.

In this connection let me say that the line and staff of the Army worked in absolute harmony. There is no legitimate criticism on the staff for what took place in reference to the shipment of troops from Tampa to Santiago.

I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized, if I may be recognized at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has moved that the committee rise.

Mr. HULL. I will withdraw that motion if the gentleman from Mississippi desires to proceed now. I will state to him, however, that the debate under the five-minute rule will proceed when this bill is taken up again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I did not understand the situation. It is now after 5 o'clock, and I understand that the five-minute debate will proceed to-morrow when this bill comes up. I will take occasion then to ask recognition.

Mr. HULL. We may not take up the bill to-morrow. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the military establishment of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HULL. I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to renew a request I made a short time ago. I am informed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] and by one or two others—I know not, of course, after how full a conference—that if we ask unanimous consent that the bill known as the "Grout bill," which was fixed as a special order for to-morrow, be taken up on Monday next, there would be no objection. I ask now of the members present if that is the understanding?

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. No; it is not. I object.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman object to unanimous consent to go on with this bill to-morrow, and let the Grout bill come up immediately afterwards?



Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, prior to the adjournment of Congress last June a majority of the House was in favor of the present consideration of the Grout bill—an overwhelming majority. We were overruled, and as a compromise accepted the special order fixing the consideration of the bill for the 6th day of December—to-morrow. I can not consent to any arrangement that will vacate that order.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

#### RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, December 4, 1900.

Hon. D. B. HENDERSON,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives:

I hereby respectfully resign my place on the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

THOMAS HEDGE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee appointments:

To the Committee on Pensions, Mr. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, of Alabama.

To the Committee on the Public Lands, Mr. FRANCIS R. LASSITER, of Virginia.

To the Committee on Railways and Canals, Mr. JOSIAH L. KERR, of Maryland.

To the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings, Mr. RICHARD A. WISE, of Virginia.

To the Select Committee on the Centennial of the Establishment of the Seat of Government in Washington, Mr. JAMES W. DENNY, of Maryland.

To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, Mr. JAMES P. CONNER, of Iowa.

#### LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. MCCALL, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Charles S. Hall, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls attention to House bill 11327, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and is returned, with the request that it be referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Without objection, this change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill (H. R. 12283) in relation to the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the permanent seat of government in the District of Columbia; when the Speaker signed the same.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1358. An act to authorize the use of depositions before naval courts in certain cases—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2399. An act to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to incorporate the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4439. An act to authorize Hon. George D. Meiklejohn, Assistant Secretary of War, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Government of Sweden and Norway—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 4830. An act to correct the military record of Ira J. Paxton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 21. An act for the relief of Clara H. Fulford—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4673. An act to encourage the holding of an interstate and West Indian exposition in the city of Charleston, in the State of South Carolina, in the year 1901—to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 4294. An act to authorize Capt. N. M. Brooks, superintendent of foreign mails, Post-Office Department, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### REPRINT OF THE ARMY REORGANIZATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the edition of the Army bill as printed has been entirely exhausted, and there is such a constant demand

for it that I ask unanimous consent that a reprint be ordered of the bill and report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the Army bill, S. 4300.

Mr. HULL. And also the report.

The SPEAKER. Including the report upon that bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understand that the gentleman from Iowa asks leave to reprint the Senate bill with the House amendments.

Mr. HULL. The whole thing is together. I suppose it would mean that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It ought to be reprinted in that form.

Mr. HULL. The whole thing, in the form in which it now appears?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is understood. You mean the Senate bill with the House amendments.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

And then, on motion of Mr. HULL (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table, and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of Labor, transmitting a statement of all moneys expended during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of harbor of Havre de Grace, Md.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Colorado River, Nevada—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and estimate for removing bar near the pier of the Southern Railway Company, Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the Ohio River in Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of San Joaquin River, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sabine Pass, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of harbor of Harrisonville, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Mahon (harbor) River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Little Tennessee River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Clinch River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Hiwassee River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey



of Tacoma Harbor, Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the President of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting the report of the board for the year ended June 30, 1900—to the Committee on Appropriations, so much as refers to appropriations; so much as refers to other matters, to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Pagan River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Pawtucket River, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Muskegon Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the sloop *Abigail*, Samuel Robinson, master, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the brig *Caroline*, Elihu Cotton, master, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Smyrna River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Chesconnessex Creek, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Fire Island Inlet, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Portland Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Trinity River, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Quantico Creek, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Mispillion River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Branford Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of river and harbor at Camden, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Beach Thoroughfare, New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Warroad Harbor and Warroad River, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sioux River, South Dakota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Skiddaway Narrows, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of

Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Long Prairie River, Minnesota—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Kootenai River, Montana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Detroit River, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditures of the Department for contingent expenses for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 12317) granting a pension to Mary Tripp—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 12236) granting a pension to Sofa T. Philip—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 11237) making an appropriation for the destruction of the aquatic plant known as the water hyacinth from streams, bayous, and other waters in Florida, Louisiana, and other Southern Atlantic and Gulf States, by chemical or mechanical means—Committee on Ways and Means discharged, and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 306) relative to the consideration of Senate bill 4300, reported in lieu thereof H. Res. 309, accompanied by a report (No. 2011).

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 12330) for the relief of inspectors of customs who performed double duty—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 12331) to amend an act entitled "An act conferring on the supreme court of the District of Columbia jurisdiction to take proof of the execution of wills affecting real estate, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1898—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 12332) for the erection of a monument to Andrew Lewis—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 12333) to provide for the extension of the charters of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 12334) to establish a supreme court for the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12335) providing for extra pay for certain soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12336) to prohibit the sale of firearms, opium, and intoxicants to aboriginal tribes and native races on the Pacific islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder—to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. TERRY: A bill (H. R. 12395) to provide for the holding of the circuit and district courts of the United States for the eastern district of Arkansas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to increase the salary of the commissioner of education provided for by said act—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 12397) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 12398) to provide for medical care and surgical treatment of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 275) requesting the President to furnish transportation to the Boers who desire to immigrate to this country—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 276) for the diversion of moneys heretofore appropriated for the harbor of Davenport, Iowa—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEELE: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 59) for the printing of the report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DALZELL, from Committee on Rules: A resolution (H. Res. 309) relative to the consideration of Senate bill 4300 (in lieu of H. Res. 306), accompanied by a report (No. 2011).

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 12337) for the relief of Maria Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 12338) paying certain claims of Charles Moran—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12339) granting an increase of pension to James F. Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 12340) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of O. P. Cobb and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 12341) to remove the charge of desertion against Jeremiah C. Lamar, late of Company E, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and authorize his honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12342) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Augustin H. Finn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12343) for the relief of James H. De Coster—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 12344) granting an increase of pension to Julia Crenshaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 12345) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Ezekiel Downey—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 12346) to remove the charge of absence without leave against the military record of Peleg T. Griffith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 12347) granting a pension to G. W. Warnick—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12348) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of the claim of the Presbyterian Church of Huntsville, Ala., for the use and occupation of said church building for Government purposes by the United States military authorities during the late war, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials pertaining to said building, and for damage to said building—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12349) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Huntsville, Ala., for the use and occupation of said church building for Government purposes by the United States military authorities during the late war, and all claims for damages resulting from the appropriation to Government use of any of the furnishings or materials pertaining to said building, and for damage to said building—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 12350) granting an increase of pension to James Paul—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 12351) granting a pension to William P. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12352) granting an increase of pension to Abram P. Pew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 12353) granting an increase of pension to Lucie M. Mabry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12354) granting a pension to Edna K. Hoyt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12355) granting an increase of pension to Mary Elizabeth Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 12356) granting a pension to General M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12357) granting a pension to Albert Guernsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12358) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Bellinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12359) granting a pension to Peter Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12360) granting a pension to Josephine A. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12361) granting a pension to Raynor H. Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12362) granting a pension to Sylvia H. Lamoireaux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12363) granting a pension to Phila A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12364) granting a pension to Mary Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12365) granting a pension to Eliza Burcaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12366) for the relief of Lemon Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12367) to correct the military record of Fremont C. Downing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12368) to correct the military record of Henry Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12369) to correct the military record of Dayton S. Peck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12370) granting a pension to all surviving employees of the Franklin shops, at Nashville, Tenn., who served six months and over during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12371) for the relief of Andrew G. Gorrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12372) for the relief of John P. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12373) for the relief of Elisha R. Swain—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12374) for the relief of Lemuel C. Canfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12375) for the relief of Carrie M. Boone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12376) for the relief of Lawrence H. Rousseau—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12377) for the relief of August Schlapp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12378) for the relief of Columbus P. French—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12379) for the relief of Omar H. Case—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12380) for the relief of Joseph Murray—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12381) for the relief of Frank M. Vowels—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12382) for the relief of Fenelon B. Matthews—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12383) for the relief of John Fuller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12384) for the relief of John A. Heald—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12385) for the relief of Hubbard K. Milward—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 12386) granting an increase of pension to William N. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12387) granting a pension to Frances L. Poe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 12388) for the relief of Caroline V. English—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12389) for the relief of Marion McKibben—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12390) for the relief of Maj. James Rockwell, jr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 12391) granting an increase of pension to James M. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 12392) granting a pension to Dr. Henry Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 12393) for the relief of Thomas Christy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 12399) to correct the military record of Thomas Curneen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of George B. Randolph, department commander of Alabama, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of House bill No. 5499, for the relief of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of Seth T. Snipe, of Bath, Me., in behalf of the Maine Department of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the consideration of House bill No. 5499, promoting the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of H. M. Orahod, department commander of Colorado and Wyoming, urging favorable action on House bill No. 5499, relating to the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY: Paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Maria Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of S. T. Harris, department commander of Tennessee, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5499, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the heirs of Elmore Preston, deceased, late of Knox County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John A. Kessler, of Washington County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Joseph Henderson, deceased, late of Washington County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of Levi Carmack, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Elijah Simerly, deceased, late of Carter County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Lincoln, Nebr., for the exclusion of slavery, rifles, and spirituous liquors from portions of Africa, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of E. A. Jones, J. A. Jones, and other citizens of China, Me., against the sale of intoxicating liquors, etc., in our new possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Vasselboro and Winthrop and petition of citizens of Unity, Me., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petitions of citizens of Belleville, Brookville, Salina, and Marysville, Kans., in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Thomas Curneen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANLER: Petitions of Egbert & Case, J. A. Willett & Co., and Fitch, Rowland & Co., of the city of New York, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the United States Brewers' Association, for the repeal of the tax on beer in the war-revenue act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association and the Maritime Association, of New York, urging the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CORLISS: Petition of citizens of Detroit, Mich., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petition of the Massachusetts Total Abstinence Society, to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in Army canteens and trading posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: Petition of certain commercial and industrial bodies of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the improvement of the Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cairo—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association, Maritime Association, and Produce Exchange, all of New York, advocating an appropriation for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of Frank Head Post, No. 16, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5779, giving veterans preferment in public service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens in the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking for the exclusion of slavery, rifles, and spirituous liquors from portions of Africa—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, asking for the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, to amend the interstate-commerce law so as to provide for the enforcement of the provisions regulating transportation rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of Philip Lawrence, department commander of South Dakota, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring early consideration of House bill No. 5499—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Resolutions of Stony Point Grange, No. 1733, Patrons of Husbandry, of Jefferson County, Ind., in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of the heirs of John Evers, deceased, late of Rockingham County, Va., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jeremiah C. Lamar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Petition of the heirs of Frederick Phillips, deceased, late of Pocahontas County, W. Va., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of Wilbur F. Henry, department commander of Missouri Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of House bill No. 5499, for the relief of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Ezekiel Downey—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petitions of J. M. Smucker, of Orrville, Ohio, and citizens of Wayne County, Ohio, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of J. M. Roundtree, of Corinth, Ark., for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: Petitions of A. J. Goodbrod, department commander of Oregon, Grand Army of the Republic, and T. A. W. Shock, commander Oregon Commandery, Loyal Legion, requesting early consideration of House bill No. 5499—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolutions of the San Diego Shakespeare Club for the purchase of the Calaveras Big Tree Grove, California, by the Government—to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Wholesalers' Board of Trade, of Los Angeles, Cal., in support of Senate bill No. 4282, and House bill No. 9882, known as the Ray bankruptcy bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the board of directors of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, relating to the preservation, reclamation, and settlement of the public domain—to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5685, to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of C. F. Hertweck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of Peter D. Smith, department commander of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of House bill No. 5499, for the relief of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of citizens of New Haven, Fort Wayne, and Waterloo, Ind., in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Independent Cavalry Troop of Fort Wayne, Ind., relating to Army reorganization—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of John K. Bucklyn, department commander of Connecticut, Grand Army of the Republic, for action on House bill No. 5499, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petition of James Paul, of Company K, New York Volunteer Infantry, for increase of pension, to accompany House bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. SHOWALTER: Petition of druggists of Sharon, Pa., for the repeal of the tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William P. Morrison, of Lawrence County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: Petition of Daniel L. Griesser and others, asking for increase of pay for keepers in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of Fulton County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Frances M. Monasmith and others, for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of the Minnesota Butter and Cheese Makers' Association, favoring the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Resolutions of Old Abe Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, indorsing House bill No. 5779, relating to appointments in the Government service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Post No. 80, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, in support of House bill No. 4742, amending section 1225 of the Revised Statutes, relating to military instruction in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Congregational Church of Clay Center, Nebr., for the exclusion of intoxicants from all countries inhabited by native races—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of John R. King, department commander of Maryland Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill No. 5499, for the relief of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WISE: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Henry Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petitions of Isaac W. Davis and P. W. Kiefaber Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. J. Williams, civil engineer, favoring the Nicaragua Ship Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, for such legislation as will strengthen our maritime position—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the National Association of Manufacturers, T. C. Search, president, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in favor of various measures for the promotion of American industries and commercial progress with other nations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of select and common councils of Philadelphia, Pa., and of the Trades League of Philadelphia, and the New Century Club and the Civic Club of Philadelphia, in favor of legislation transferring the present mint building to the city of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of chemists and druggists of Philadelphia, Pa., for the repeal of the special tax on proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Christy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Affidavits of 26 members of the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, in favor of the bill granting the surviving members of said companies medals of honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Gettysburg, Pa., to accompany House bill No. 9278, for the relief of George W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 6, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### LANDS IN WASHINGTON CITY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with a copy of a report from Col. Theo. A. Bingham, submitting plans, estimate of cost, etc., for the treatment of that section of the District of Columbia situated south of Pennsylvania avenue, etc.

The Chair does not know to what committee the communication should go.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think beyond a question it should go to the Committee on the District of Columbia primarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the manuscript ordered printed. I think the Chair had perhaps better not order the plans to be printed until the committee has examined them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly not. The manuscript will be sufficient.

### REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1900; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

### REPORT ON REINDEER IN ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson upon "The introduction of domestic reindeer into the district of Alaska" for the year 1900.

The Chair calls the attention of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to this report.

Mr. TELLER. I have a resolution to offer, providing for the printing of an extra number of copies, which I suppose must go to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Where will the Senator have the report go?

Mr. TELLER. I do not know where the report ought to go. I want to have it printed, and that is about all there is of it. It should go to the Committee on Appropriations, I suppose.

Mr. KYLE. The Committee on Territories.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be referred to the Committee on Printing, with the accompanying map.

Mr. TELLER. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. VEST. What is the resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not in order, but if there is no objection it will be received.

Mr. TELLER. I ask unanimous consent that it may be passed now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there be printed 10,000 copies additional to the usual number of the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson upon the Introduction of Domestic Reindeer into the District of Alaska, for 1900, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 6,000 copies for the use of the Commissioner of Education.

### LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of buildings under the control of that Department for which, for reasons stated in each case, it is necessary, in order to insure their proper completion, that the limit of cost should be extended by Congress; which, on motion of Mr. ALLISON, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

### HARBOR AT GALVESTON, TEX.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with a copy of a report of the Board of Engineers recently convened at Galveston, Tex., to make an examination of the effect of the storm of September 8, 1900, on the jetties and main ship channel at Galveston.

The communication and accompanying papers will be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and the accompanying plans will be referred to the committee without printing.

The Chair also lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with copy of a report of the Board of Engineers recently convened at Galveston, Tex., for the purpose of reporting upon the damage to the fortifications at Galveston Harbor by the hurricane of September 8, 1900, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair also lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with a copy of a report of the Board of Engineers recently convened at Galveston, Tex., for the purpose of investigating the effect of the storm of September 8, 1900, on the jetties of the Brazos River, etc.

The communication and manuscript will be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and the plans accompanying the same will be referred to the committee without printing.